

THE
FORTNIGHTLY
REVIEW.

EDITED BY
JOHN MORLEY.

VOL. XXX. NEW SERIES.
JULY TO DECEMBER 1881
(VOL. XXXVI. OLD SERIES.)

LONDON:
CHAPMAN AND HALL, LIMITED,
11, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.
1881.

[*The Right of Translation is reserved.*]

LONDON :
PRINTED BY J. S. VIRTUE AND CO., LIMITED,
CITY ROAD.

Jitarpara Jaisrst Public Library
Acq. No. 10384 Date 16.6.76

CONTENTS.

AUTHOR.	PAGE
* ARNOLD, Matthew	Irish Grammar Schools 137
BEVINGTON, Louisa J.	The Moral Colour of Rationalism . . . 179
BIRD, J.	Commercial Treaties a Surrender of Principle 253
BLENNERHASSETT, Sir R., M.P.	The Land Question in Europe . . . 238
BLENNERHASSETT, Lady	A Page in Diplomatic History . . . 759
BLUNT, Wilfrid S.	The Future of Islam, I. 204
	" " II. 315
	" " III. 411
	" " IV. 585
CHESNEY, Colonel George	Over-Production 371
CHIROL, M. Valentino	Bulgaria 281
CHRISTIE, Mary M.	The Dry Bones of Popular Education . 355
DALGLEISH, J. S.	Popular Education: A Reply . . . 513
DAVIDSON, Thomas	Antonio Rosmini 553
DICEY, A. V.	Two Acts of Union: a Contrast . . . 168
	How is the Law to be Enforced in Ireland? 539
DOYLE, Sir F. H., Bart.	Napoleon the Idol 294
* DUFF, Grant, Rt. Hon. M. E.	An Unspoken Speech 299
EDEN, F.	The Salmon Fisheries 621
EDITOR	Conciliation with Ireland 1
FLEMING, William	Railways and Waterways 432
FRISBY, Alfred	Has Conservatism increased in England since the last Reform Bill? . . . 718
GALLENCA, A.	Italy: Her Home and Foreign Policy . 27
✓ GURNEY, Edmund	A Chapter in the Ethics of Pain . . . 778
* KENT, Armine T.	Leigh Hunt as a Poet 224
LATHBURY, D. C.	Radicals and Irish Ideas 267
	Atheists in Parliament 671
LAVELEYE, Emile de	Bimetallism and Free Trade 108
LESLIE, Cliffo T. E.	The History and Future of Interest and Profit 640

AUTHOR.		PAGE
*MAINE, Sir Henry S.	The King and Early Civil Justice . . .	603
PALGRAVE, W. Gifford	Kioto	680
PERRY, Walter C.	Recent Excavations in Pergamon . . .	333
POLE, Dr. William, F.R.S. . . .	The Bergsturz at Elm	730
*POLLOCK, Frederick	Atman	26
	History of Law as a Branch of Politics.	478
RATHBONE, W., M.P.	Reform in Parliamentary Business . .	399
'ROBERTS, William Hazlitt . . .	Co-operative Farming	195
ROMANES, George J.	A Scientific Defence of Organic Evolu-	
	tion	739
† SAINTSBURY, George	Victor Hugo's New Volumes	40
	A New Life of Voltaire	149
SAMUELSON, B., M.P.	Technical Education in Saxony . . .	91
SPENCER, Herbert	Compound Political Heads	51
THOMAS, EDWARD A.	The Latter Day Saints as they are . .	414
TORRENS, Sir Robert	The Land Laws	98
TREMENHEERE, Hugh S.	Thriftless Thrift	701
TROLLOPE, FRANCES E.	Italian Realistic Fiction	459
'TURNER, C. E.	Nekrasoff	499
WEDDERBURN, Sir David, M.P. . .	Denmark	76
WILSON, Schütz H.	A Volume of French Souvenirs . . .	346
Home and Foreign Affairs	126, 260, 388, 527, 660, 797	
Disgust: A Dramatic Monologue		715
Author of <i>City of Dreadful Night</i> . The Deliverer		617

THE
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CLXXV. NEW SERIES.—JULY 1, 1881.

CONCILIATION WITH IRELAND.

“ Mr. Fox stated, in a very eloquent speech which he delivered in 1797, the principles upon which he conceived the government of Ireland should be conducted. He stated, in his usual frank, it might be said incautious, manner, that he conceived that concessions should be made to the people of Ireland ; he said, if he found he had not conceded enough he would concede more ; he said that he thought the only way of governing Ireland was to please the people of Ireland, that he knew no better source of strength to this country ; and he declared in one sentence, which I will read to the House, his wish with respect to the government of Ireland. ‘ My wish is,’ said Mr. Fox, ‘ that the whole people of Ireland should have the same principles, the same system, the same operation of government, and, though it may be a subordinate consideration, that all classes should have an equal chance of emolument: in other words, I would have the whole Irish government regulated by Irish notions and Irish prejudices. And I firmly believe, according to another Irish expression, the more she is under Irish government, the more will she be bound to English interests.’ ”—LORD JOHN RUSSELL, in introducing the *Irish Municipal Reform Bill*, 1837.

I.

THE quotation from Fox which I have just written down, read in the light of existing circumstances, suggests some doubts whether on the whole either the temper or the vision of English liberalism in respect of Ireland is as good as it once was. If he found that he had not conceded enough, said Fox, he would concede more ; he thought that the only way of governing Ireland was to please the people of Ireland ; he would have the whole Irish Government regulated by Irish notions and Irish prejudices. Can we imagine Mr. Forster or Lord Hartington or Sir William Harcourt talking in this way ? On the contrary, what they habitually say is that they will not consent to hand Ireland over to Irish notions and Irish prejudices ; that in governing Ireland, they must remember that at the same time they have to please the people of England ; that they are willing to concede so much, but that nothing on earth shall induce them to concede an inch more. Yet the further we are removed from the events in which Fox took part, the more conspicuously does that great man’s far-sighted and courageous sagacity appear. It is true that his political principles did not bring him power, and it may be that a return to them would again exclude his party from office. It would

not be the first time that English Liberals have deliberately faced exclusion, rather than abandon a just, generous, and in the long run an inevitable policy of conciliation towards Ireland. "The time will come," said Macaulay in one of the finest pieces in the records of English oratory, "when history will do justice to the Whigs of England, and will faithfully relate how much they did and suffered for Ireland; how for the sake of Ireland they remained out of office more than twenty years, braving the frowns of the Court, braving the hisses of the multitude, renouncing power and patronage and salaries and peerages and garters, and yet not obtaining in return even a little fleeting popularity."¹ All this was done for the sake of Catholic Emancipation. The successors of these eminent men are not likely to have to undergo as much as this in the great work of carrying out that Emancipation to its natural and unavoidable political consequences. But it is to be wished that they would face the prospect before them, whatever sacrifice it may involve, and that prospect, as every serious politician is well aware in his heart, comprehends a great deal more than a Land Bill.

In Fox's time conciliation with Ireland was a wise and humane article of policy. In our time it is nothing short of a great necessity of state. Ireland is no longer reduced to take anything that she can get. The prosperous multitudes of Irishmen across the Atlantic have given her both heart and material resources. One of the commonest arguments against separation is that, if England were ever drawn into a war, she would have in an independent Ireland a hostile power on her flank. As if we had not a hostile power on our flank now. As it is, if England is ever drawn into a war, shall we not be still forced to keep an army in Ireland, and cruisers on its coasts, exactly as if it were the seat of an independent enemy? It is too clear to need argument that the disaffection of Ireland is a direct and not inconsiderable source of military weakness to Great Britain, and that it is more so now than it ever was. There are other ways in which we are weakened from a military point of view, and our hands tied. What these are we need not now stay to discuss; but, for one thing, it is rather serious to find that Ireland is failing us as a recruiting-ground. The advocates of a spirited foreign policy and English ascendancy in the counsels of Europe ought to be the most eager for the reconciliation of Ireland, for the latter is an indispensable condition of the former. In domestic policy it is the same. Everybody can see for himself that we shall get little English legislation accomplished so long as the Irish members are expected by their constituencies to do their best to prevent it. Changes in the rules of Parliamentary procedure may slightly lessen the evil, but they will in no sense remove it. Unless we recognise and act upon Fox's

(1) Speech on Repeal of the Union, February 6, 1833.

doctrine that the only way of governing Ireland is to please the people of Ireland, we may be quite sure that the people of Ireland will find means, as they have found means, of preventing us from governing ourselves. Let any one who doubts this consider the history of the last session and of this.

Conciliation must depend upon pleasing the people of Ireland, but we shall instantly be told that the only way of pleasing the people of Ireland is to let them go away from us altogether, bag and baggage, and set up on their own account. This decisive utterance is supposed to settle the question. Conciliation in plain English means separation; separation is impracticable; *argal*, conciliation is impracticable. This would be conclusive enough, and desperate enough, if the two premisses of the syllogism must be taken as demonstrably true. As a matter of fact neither one nor other of these has yet been proved. To take the minor premiss first. I am one of those who believe that separation would be a distinct step backwards, and would be a disadvantage to Ireland itself. I am not thinking of what an independent Ireland would do in the way of endowing the Catholic clergy, making education denominational, and unjustly using the landlords. Such things as these she would manage better than they are likely to be managed for her by a country which gives the power of veto to the landlords alone in one branch of the legislature, and which is so little sympathetic with Catholicism that not a single Catholic is returned by an English or Scotch constituency to the other. But there are more serious aspects of an independent Ireland; precisely from the Irish point of view. Not to name more than two considerations. An independent Ireland, as Mr. Mill and others have pointed out, besides having to defend herself against all other enemies, internal and external, without English help, would feel obliged to keep herself always armed and in readiness to fight England. "An Irishman must have a very lofty idea of the resources of his country who thinks that this load upon the Irish taxpayer would be easily borne. A war-tax assessed upon the soil, for want of other taxable material, would be no small set-off against what the peasant would gain even by the entire cessation of rent."¹

The second consideration is that an independent Ireland would be sure to resort at once to that evil economic policy which has found favour in our colonies, and in the United States. They are only able to endure its consequences because they have immense natural resources to fall back upon. But Ireland has none of these natural resources to save her from the ruinous scrape in which protective duties, bounties, and subsidies would in no long time assuredly involve her. If these two considerations stood alone, they are enough to make a sensible Irishman think twice before he commits

(1) *England and Ireland*, p. 28.

himself to the cry for separation. But though separation would be a disgrace to us, and a misfortune to them, it is absurd to say that it is impossible. Not only is it not impossible, but we are bound to accept and allow Macaulay's fervid ejaculation, "If, on a fair trial, it is found that Great Britain and Ireland cannot exist happily together as parts of one empire, in God's name let them separate."

But let us turn to the first proposition. Is it clear that conciliation is only another word for separation? It is undoubtedly true that the majority of the population of Ireland have been alienated from Great Britain; that they neither understand nor like the English character; and that they bitterly dislike and resent the English system of government. It would be nothing short of a miracle if this were otherwise. But let us not overlook the following very pertinent considerations on the other side. 1. There is a powerful and resolute part of the population of Ireland, which at present stands firm by the English connection, and is all the more likely to adhere to it if the demands of the Ulster tenants are satisfied. 2. There is no reason to believe that even outside of Ulster the desire for separation is profound, passionate, and urgent. We know how irresistible the cry for Repeal once seemed, yet, as has been justly pointed out, it all died away, and for twenty years Parliament was free from any combination aiming at the legislative independence of Ireland.¹ Mr. Parnell failed utterly to secure a strong demonstration for Home Rule until he tacked Land Reform on to it. 3. If the Irish voters felt that there was any real chance of separation, they would soon begin to count the cost. If they were living under a land system suited to their particular requirements, and if they felt that they had a real voice in the settlement of their own business, they are not so little like other human beings as to sacrifice peaceful stability of this kind for the sake of a new arrangement, which they would have to fight for, and which after all would give them no more substantial advantages than they would enjoy without it.

Although, however, for these and other reasons, conciliation of a practical and working kind does seem to be attainable without separation; yet I for one cannot believe that it will ever be attained without a plain recognition in the mind of the English people and by the English Government of the Irish national sentiment. The great miscarriage of our attempt to govern Ireland is due to the fact that we treated them as if they were barbarians up to 1829, and then we suddenly treated them as if they were full-blown Englishmen. What remains to be tried is the plan of treating them as a distinct nationality, with views, traditions,

(1) Mr. Courtney has worked this out in his article in the *International Review* for January, 1881.

interests, a religion, a character, all of its own. It is odd, or it would be odd, if we English and Scotch were of a more readily imaginative and sympathetic stock, that we so stubbornly refuse to see what every foreigner can see. M. Louis Blanc was in England at the time of the Fenian troubles in 1869, and it struck him as inexplicable that "considering the state of the relations created between England and Ireland by long oppression, the national aspirations of the country which has had so much to suffer should be regarded as the blackest of crimes by the country which has so much to reproach itself with." This, he said, was what nobody with an impartial and equitable spirit could pretend to justify.¹ This is the frame of mind which circumstances will drive us to cast out. Conciliation does not mean separation, but it does mean a recognition of these national aspirations as something which we have no choice but to satisfy. There are perfectly feasible ways of trying to do this, and until we have made the attempt it is mere impotent folly to talk about the ingratitude of the Irish people and the hopelessness of the Irish problem.

II.

It is not difficult to discern the course of the immediate events which have in gradual succession and strictly connected series brought affairs to their condition at this moment. We have now lost sight of the three bad seasons which made the payment of rent impossible, but in fact this circumstance was the source and fountain of all the mischief that has happened since. If there had been no other cause at work this misfortune might have been tided over, as happens in other countries. In Ireland other causes are always close at hand to turn any occurrence into an occasion for a social or a political rising.

As it happened, the Act of 1870 had not prevented the raising of rents, but had even in some cases promoted it. In no case was it calculated, and there seems good reason for doubting whether the Bill of 1881 is calculated, to meet the difficulty of falling times. The eternal grievance of the Irish tenant, which had been lulled by the prosperity of the years between 1871 and 1876, was awakened into fresh life by the adversity of the three years which followed. The tenant persists in regarding, and as Professor Richey has pointed out in these pages, the Land Bill now before Parliament agrees in regarding, the relation between landlord and tenant as a relation of partnership. During the bad harvests from 1877 to 1879 the landlord who insisted on rents without abatement seemed to his tenant to be usurping the position of a preference shareholder, leaving all the loss to the holder of ordinary stock. Temporary reductions of rent were made, but it seems to be established that a considerable proportion of

(1) *Dix Ans de l'Hist. d'Angleterre*, vol. x. p. 107.

the landlords refused to make any abatements. For evidence of the harsh usage to which many tenants were exposed, we need not go beyond the Disturbance Bill, which was brought into Parliament a year ago. The Government would have been guilty of trifling with Parliament and the country unless they had good reason to believe that some landlords were likely to exact rents which it was neither expedient nor equitable that the tenant should be forced to pay.

This real danger to the tenants fell in with the designs of the Irish politicians. Mr. Parnell had already won the enthusiastic confidence of the peasantry, chiefly for the reason which may so well chagrin ourselves, that he was supposed to have found out the secret of harassing, resisting, and humiliating the British Parliament. The ballot had given the peasantry political power, and Mr. Parnell is showing them how to use it for the re-assertion in legal and constitutional form of their claim to a national life of their own. The cry for Home Rule, however, had not kindled any overwhelming amount of enthusiasm. It was necessary to attract the tenant-farmers from another side; their sufferings from bad seasons, and their discontent against the landlords, pointed pretty plainly to the quarter from which they were easily accessible. The Land League was thus the result of a genuine demand for combination on the part of the peasantry, dexterously and energetically utilised by Mr. Parnell and his friends.

The rejection of the Disturbance Bill by the House of Lords was the step which at once confirmed the power and stimulated the activity of the Land League. It was the announcement to the Irish people that, however friendly the Ministers might be, there was a perverse and hostile power in the English system of Government which even well-meaning Ministers themselves could not always keep under control. This was at the outset a signal misfortune for a policy of conciliation. It irritated that suspicious temper which is always (and quite naturally and justly, considering the general tenour of English dealings with Ireland) present in the Irish mind and always ready to blaze out. It had another and a worse effect. If the Land League was to be good for anything, it was bound by all its professions and the very purpose of its existence to protect its clients against those evictions which the Government and the majority of the House of Commons had declared it to be inequitable to carry out. The strike against excessive rents which took place in the autumn, under the guidance of the League, was accompanied by a certain number, though an exceedingly small number, of acts of outrage and intimidation. These were set down to the deliberate instigation and direct contrivance of the Land League. They were, in fact, the spontaneous outbreak of the feeling of the districts where they took place. They were the violent expressions of a public

opinion and temper, which was very far from needing to be stimulated by any organization from without. This has been shown only too conclusively by what has happened since.

In all the exasperation of panic and all the helplessness of a protected caste, the landlords flew to the Castle for protection. They clamoured that the Government should deliver the mutinous tenants into their hands, not indeed for the gallows as their great-grand-fathers would have done, but for other purposes hardly less cruel. Mr. Forster resisted, and perhaps would have continued to resist, if the clamour of the minority in Ireland had not been reinforced by the rising anger of the majority in England. The English did not well understand the real merits of the struggle, but they were fired by a humane indignation at the disgusting cruelties which were inflicted here and there on dumb animals. In this way the Government allowed themselves to be driven upon the policy of Coercion. This has completed the alienation which had been begun by the action of the House of Lords. The peculiar circumstances under which the Coercion Bills were passed, the urgency, the suspensions, the expulsions, however inevitable they may have been, certainly did not make the drug more palatable. The exercise of the powers which were thus conferred on the authorities has not been rigorous or harsh, but we may depend upon it that the arrest of Mr. Dillon (like the re-arrest of Davitt) will leave a mark on the Irish memory that will add to English difficulties for a long time to come. Meanwhile force has been found, as Burke said of it in the case of the American colonists, "not an odious but a feeble instrument." It is no crime, but it has turned out a blunder. Limerick the other day was the scene of turbulent outbreak, in spite of the fact that a hundred men and more had been arrested on the warrant of the Lord Lieutenant. Troops were poured in, and the turbulent spirits were instantly overawed. But the troops could have been poured in without a Coercion Act. We have put Ireland under the ban, but that has not even restored order for the time, much less has it made reconciliation easier for the future.

This is the string of causes that have immediately led to the present crisis. "We cannot say, therefore," observes an Irish journalist very justly, "that any party is exclusively to blame for our present misfortunes. The guilt of anything that has happened lies upon many. We cannot acquit the landlords, who are unrelentingly pressing for rents, which they know cannot possibly be paid; nor the Land Leaguers, who have stimulated the people to a point of resistance to authority which is not to be justified; nor the House of Lords, who, reckless of results, have forced forward the present condition of things by their unfeeling rejection of the Disturbance Bill; nor the Government, who, before removing admitted grievances,

have fallen back on the irritating policy of force ; nor the Parliament, who are wasting time in talk while the country suffers. The people, who, from ignorance and evil advice, and wretchedness, are driven into a resistance which they would never think of if kindly treated, are, perhaps, least blameworthy ; but in so far as they break the law and resist authority, even they are not to be excused.”¹ No, they are not to be excused if we were holding some rigid ethical assize, but that can never be the function of government. Statesmen are ill fitted for their business if they confound it with the office of the censor and the inquisitor. It is their work not to deliver verdicts, but to compose suits ; not to measure out the strict letter of an artificial justice, but to devise measures of peace and reconciliation. It is true that in some parts of Ireland the populace has resisted the officers of the law, but censure of all such violence ought to be tempered with moderation when we remember that by universal confession the law in Ireland is an accomplice of unjust dealing, and operates in connivance with oppression. It may be true that this sombre and ignorant populace has fallen into the hands of bad leaders, but this is only because that once powerful class who ought to have been their leaders, so long preferred to be their tyrants. The example of France is enough to teach us that when a territorial aristocracy deliberately abdicates every duty that can justify its privileges or its existence, and when the peasantry whom it has neglected or oppressed, at last succeed in loosening the bonds, it is almost inevitable that power should be seized, for a time at any rate, by some of the most violent and least competent. You may think what you please of the Egans and the Healys, but the worse you think of them, and the more contemptuous your estimate of their character, their motives, their ability, by so much the more decisive ought to be our condemnation of the whole system of government and of the caste who made it possible that such men as these are taken to be should have acquired this mastery.

III.

These are the considerations which ought to temper our minds to lenity in judging the people of Ireland. Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Americans, may condemn their ferocity, their lawlessness, their truthlessness, as much as ever they please. But Englishmen are the last people in the world who have a right to sit in judgment upon the Irish for all these things. It is English misgovernment which has directly engendered Irish vices. We have imposed bad laws upon them ; we have persecuted their religion down to times when persecution elsewhere had long gone out of fashion ; we have cowed them by the sword and corrupted them by gold. Who is

(1) *Londonderry Standard*, June 7, 1881.

not wearied of hearing this long and unanswerable indictment? But the worst of it is that we have not yet heard it often enough to learn its lesson, the lesson of patience and considerateness in dealing with a people whom our own careless misrule has made what they are, and whom only supreme patience and considerateness will make anything better than what they are. "The English nation," the Conservative newspaper tells us, "is fast losing its temper. In plain words, and to speak plain words is a duty at such a moment, it is getting its back up." And in truth this seems to be the case. The promptitude with which some Englishmen are capable of calling out for vengeance on Ireland was illustrated the day after the discovery of the explosive matter at the door of the Town Hall at Liverpool. The incident was certainly one well fitted to disquiet men's minds, but it was assuredly not of a kind to warrant the detestable talk which, according to the *Liverpool Journal*, was to be heard on the Exchange of that town, and which was to the effect that "England has several times shown itself capable of putting Ireland under martial law of the severest and most cruel kind; that, in spite of more enlightened views of Irish history, the same feeling may revive; and that sharp and sanguinary repression may be demanded by such an overpowering English and Scotch clamour that Ministers may be powerless to resist it." Even the *Times* itself, which knows how to clothe vindictive emotions with grave words, pointed plainly in the same direction, and hinted like the merchants on the Liverpool flags at sharp and sanguinary repression. "Proclamations, coercion laws, arrests of individuals—these methods have been tried," said the *Times*, "and with no satisfactory result hitherto. One experiment there is, the most natural, the most obvious, the most certain to succeed, which remains nevertheless untried." That this reflects a strong set of the current of feeling in the country it is impossible to deny. The following account is from a cool and well-informed correspondent, who has no particular sympathy with the sentiments that he describes. "I can only convey to you," he says, "a faint notion of the strength of the antagonism to the Irish programme which the hostile and harassing attitude assumed by the Irish Party in Parliament towards the Government has aroused in many good Liberals, nay, in good Radicals. Their conduct is almost universally condemned; their ingratitude has become a subject of rigorous comment; they have now scarcely a friend, where formerly they were numerous; and they have created the danger that their attitude may yet provoke the people into a determination to deny justice. I am not speaking solely of the tone of the 'moderate Liberal' who is always going to join his Tory friends—but of men whose Radicalism is above suspicion. On the other hand I feel bound to add that I believe that it would give general satisfaction to the Liberal Party if some step—either a

measure legally stopping them, or a clause in the Land Bill making compensation retrospective, or a refusal of military and police aid to evicting landlords—could be taken by the Government which would put an immediate stop to the evictions.”

In reading all this we may recall a passage in which Carlyle contrasts the “noisy vehement Irish” with the Berserkir rage of the Saxon British—“deep-hidden it lies, far down in the centre, like genial central fire, with stratum after stratum of arrangement, traditionary method, composed productiveness, all built above it, vivified and rendered fertile by it; justice, clearness, silence, perseverance, unhesitating unrelenting diligence, hatred of disorder, hatred of injustice, which is the worst disorder, characterise this people.” It is peculiarly edifying to hear the noble compliments thus bestowed by the Scotchman upon the Englishman on their common virtues, at the expense of their “poor Celtiberian brothers, armed only with rags, ignorance, and nakedness.” Who, as he listens to that impressive contrast, could dream that it is exactly these Saxon British who have made their “poor Celtiberian brother” what he is; that it is they who have held his destinies in the hollow of their hand for century after century, have been able to do as they pleased with him, and that the best thing that they were pleased to make of him was that ragged and ignorant “Milesian whom the English coachman, as he whirls past, lashes with his whip and curses with his tongue.”¹ Instead of justice, clearness, silence, unhesitating unrelenting diligence, the Irishman has had until within fifty years from the Saxon British, the precise opposites of all these fine things; instead of justice he has had oppression; instead of clearness, aimless confusion; instead of unrelenting diligence, he has had incompetence and neglect; instead of silence, execration.

After all, Berserkir rage is magnificent but it is not politics. Before “good Liberals, nay, even good Radicals” suffer themselves to be provoked into “a determination to deny justice”—a sign of Berserkir rage, indeed—it is well to ask whether the provocation has really been inordinate; whether we have looked at Irish turbulence in its true and unexaggerated proportions. We can only make sure of this by placing ourselves at a distance, and history in the hands of a competent guide is something still more useful than philosophy teaching by examples. Nothing can be more instructive than to compare the present outbreak with the Whiteboy outrages of the earlier part of the century, as Sir George Lewis has described and analysed them. In many of their external features these disturbances were the exact counterpart of the disorders of which we have been reading in the newspapers for the last seven or eight months. The threatening notices, the boycotting, the maiming of cattle,

(1) *Chartism*, ch. iv.

the burning of cabins, the cardings, beatings, shootings, the introduction of strangers for the execution of the secret decrees;—all the misdeeds of to-day are merely a reproduction of the kind of misdeeds that were perpetrated fifty years ago, though they are now practised on a vastly reduced scale. In general aim and character, again, there is a complete resemblance between the Whiteboy societies and the Land League. “It has already been explained,” says Sir George Lewis, “how the Irish peasant, constantly living in extreme poverty, is liable by the pressure of certain changes or by ejectment from his holding, to be driven to utter destitution—to a state in which himself and family can only rely on a most precarious charity to save them from exposure to the elements, from nakedness, and from starvation. It is natural that the most improvident persons should seek to struggle against such fearful consequences as these; that they should try to use some means of quieting apprehensions which, even if never realised, would themselves be sufficient to embitter the lives of the most thoughtless, and it is to afford security that the Whiteboy combinations are formed. *The Whiteboy association may be considered as a vast Trades’ Union for the protection of the Irish peasantry*: the object being not to regulate the rate of wages or the hours of work, but to keep the actual occupant in possession of his land, and in general to regulate the relation of landlord and tenant for the benefit of the latter.”¹

This description of the Whiteboy associations as a vast trades’ union for the protection of the Irish peasantry has, of course, been applied over and over again to the Land League. There was organization then, as there is now, though it was of a much lower type, but in either case it would be to mistake the character of the movement if we were to attribute too much to organization. There is every reason to suppose that the conclusion of the shrewd judge of evidence to whom we have referred, is not less true now than it was when he arrived at it.

“The manner in which the system is to be worked,” says Lewis, “the crimes to be committed, and the mode of committing them, are of course the subject of consultation among the parties concerned; all or most of whom doubtless know one another. There does not appear to be any such regular organization as deserves the name of *Committees* bestowed by some of the witnesses on these meetings. It seems as if the combination was very imperfect, except at times, when a blow is to be struck.”

Again :—

“We must guard against an error, not unfrequently committed, of attributing to insurgents a fixed design and a consistent course of policy. We see how wavering and changeable are the plans even of settled governments. . . . How much less unity of purpose and consistency of action is to be expected in bands

(1) *Irish Disturbances*, pp. 98—9.

of ignorant peasants, unaccustomed to the management of business, meeting only by stealth and at long intervals, unable to communicate with one another, and scantily supplied with information: when they rise in small scattered bodies over a considerable tract of country.”¹

What, then, is at the root and heart of the movement? “Not the banding together of a few outcasts who betake themselves to illegal courses, and prey on the rest of the community; but the deliberate association of the peasantry, seeking by cruel outrage to insure themselves against the evils of utter destitution and abandonment. Its influence, therefore, even when unseen, is general; it is, in fact, the mould into which Irish society is cast; the expression of the wants and feelings of the great mass of the community.”²

Having proved that the Whiteboyism of this time sprang from the peculiar position of the peasantry, which made the possession of land a necessary of life, Sir George Lewis observes, as a matter of course concerning all disturbances that have such an origin, that it is needless to say that there is no prospect of suppressing them by mere punishment so long as the same causes continue in force.

“All species of legal severity compatible with our form of government and our state of civilisation have been tried and have failed. *Pœnarum exhaustum satis est.* . . . But even if coercive measures had been more successful than they have proved, if the law of the State had waged a more prosperous war with the law of the Whiteboy [the Land League], it would be advisable to remove, as far as possible, the motive and tendency to disturbance. Without a criminal law a State could not exist; but the less reliance that is placed on this ultimate sanction, the sounder is the condition of the society.”

Finally, I will transcribe the words of another contemporary observer:—

“Let us recognise the fact that when public passion is raised to such a point as this and is so unanimous in repudiating a claim, then the claim and the right may exist, but its exercise is impossible. Severities, violences, decrees of the courts, seizures, bloody collisions between the army and the population, all such means as these will be sterile and impotent. You may be able to shed much blood, but it will be powerless; neither the tithe nor its amount will be paid. And what is most remarkable here is that the power of the Irish people does not lie in a rebellion in the open field, but in a resistance wholly passive. The Irish rebels in 1831 sometimes committed violent and sanguinary acts. . . . But what makes the force of the rebellion irresistible is its cool and calculated character.”

We may look at these past transactions with a coolness that is difficult to preserve while they are actually present; but the lesson is the same, and the practical moral is the same. We have all got into the habit of using too high-sounding words for Irish turbulence. The Irish passion for exaggeration infects their English masters

(1) *Irish Disturbances*, p. 172.

(2) *Ibid.* p. 206.

where Irish riot is concerned. The newspapers make mountains out of molehills. A fray between a crowd of viragos and a bailiff is called a battle; and if a mob throws stones at a troop of dragoons we think that we are within measurable distance of civil war. There is bad rough work in Ireland, but we make too much of it. We confuse political with social disorder. The Irish would perhaps like to throw off the English yoke, but that is not the business that they have in their minds at present. What we now see are the operations of "a vast Trades Union for the protection of the Irish peasantry," and these may be good or bad, but they are no excuse for Berserkir rage. They are all the less so as the said rage will only have the effect in the long run of making our task in Ireland a hundred times more difficult, and a satisfactory settlement more hopeless.

IV.

One highly remarkable fact must strike everyone who has attended to the political history of Ireland. It is this, that the very agencies from which we have expected the best results have, one after another, been found only to increase our difficulties. Every medicine that we have tried has produced effects precisely the reverse of those ascribed to it in the accepted pharmacopœia of politics. The sedative has operated like a stimulant, and what ought to have been an anodyne has turned out to be a furious irritant. We devised an elaborate system of primary instruction, which was to spread enlightenment and to bring loyalty. What has been the result? Where one man or woman was able to read a nationalist newspaper thirty years ago, hundreds are able to do so now. The spread of literary enlightenment has only extended the knowledge of English misgovernment, and deepened the resentment against it. Then one of the most sagacious of English Ministers had the courage to propose a great extension of the grant for educating the Catholic clergy at home. "Let us treat Maynooth," said Peel, "in a generous spirit, in the hope that we shall be met in a spirit corresponding with ours, and that we shall reap the fruits of that educational establishment." We have reaped no fruits from it; on the contrary, the tone of the priesthood is believed to have deteriorated since the acquirement of Maynooth. Next there came the great exodus. Emigration, cried the economist, is the true way of reaching a natural equation of supply and demand. What the economist forgot, as the root of the matter is unhappily so often forgotten by him, was that the particular commodity in this case chanced to be endowed with the inconvenient qualities of sentiment, passion, sympathy, and a tremendously long and vindictive memory. This famous engine of relief has become the chief instrument of mortification to us, and it is that very host of emigrants, on whose departure the political economist

shook hands in such high spirits with the statesman, who are now sending many hundreds of pounds every month to be the sinews of war for the Land League, whose random brutalities of hostile utterance make our very gorge rise, whose violent and unconcealed designs are at this moment the subject of remonstrance to the Government which permits them. Emigration may have been an economic success; it has, politically, at any rate, both for England and the United States, been a disastrous failure.

National education and emigration, then, have only increased the difficulties which they were to remove. Can less be said of the successive attempts that have been made to settle the burning question of the Land? The British legislature set up the Encumbered Estates Court with the best intentions and on the soundest economic principles. The political economist was still the dictator of the hour. Clear away the embarrassed landlords, he said; secure new owners with capital; let land be dealt with like any other commodity on the regular maxims of sound commerce. Accordingly the landlord was empowered by Act of Parliament to sell that which was not either by equity or custom his own. He parted with the fee of the land without any reservation of the tenant's claim to compensation for those improvements, which, whether they were great or small, were still what distinguished cultivated land from bog and waste. If we consider that one-fourth of the area of Ireland has passed through the Encumbered Estates Court within the last thirty years, we have a measure of the scale on which this immense confiscation of the property of the peasants has been carried on. Here, then, was another fatal miscalculation; another infallible remedy which instantly aggravated the patient's disorder. To cure the new symptoms of mischief which this unlucky treatment at once provoked, an Act was passed (1860) declaring in terms that the relation between landlord and tenant was founded upon contract and not upon tenure. How brilliantly successful this was we may gather from the very pertinent circumstance that, ten years later (1870), another Act was passed which rested entirely on the principle that the relation between landlord and tenant is founded upon tenure and by no means upon contract. The statutory declaration of the opposite doctrine in 1860 had terrified the tenants into increasing agitation, and it had become necessary to introduce legislation of an admittedly retrograde character, for the purpose of palliating potent evils, and allaying not ill-founded discontent.¹ Still untaught by failure, the English Government could not take heart to be as retrograde as the potent evils of the situation obviously required. If ever a measure was dictated by beneficent purpose, and framed with industrious atten-

(1) Professor Richey's words in describing the results of the Act of 1860. (*The Irish Land Laws*, published by Messrs. Macmillan last year, p. 61.)

tion and skill, it was the Act of 1870. Yet, as we are finding out to our cost to-day, this Act not only failed to give the tenant what he desired and has reasonable grounds for expecting, but it called into existence new evils and fresh grievances.

It is not necessary to pursue the series; we need not prolong the thankless task of enumerating the whole mortifying list of legislative disappointments. But let us not miss the point and moral of it. It is a list which in many respects shows English statesmanship at its best—honest, diligent, hopeful, persevering. Both of the two great political parties have tried their hands at solving the enigma of the Irish Sphinx. It was the Conservatives who carried, and felt that they had no practical alternative but to carry, the great initial measure of Catholic Emancipation. Sir Robert Peel must divide with Lord John Russell the responsibility for the Encumbered Estates Act. It was Peel who proposed the grant for Maynooth and the great increase in its annual endowment, and it was the same sagacious man who made the honourable experiment of the Queen's Colleges. It seems as if there must be some sinister fatality to account for what looks like so extraordinary a failure in an experiment which has been undertaken under conditions so varied, by statesmen so fertile in resource, through means apparently so skilfully contrived to their ends. But fatality can no more be admitted in politics than in science. It is better to seek a rational explanation, and if all our experiments have failed in Ireland, this can only be because we are either pursuing an impossible result, or because our efforts are directed by a method fundamentally erroneous. The presiding idea must be at fault, and in truth it is at fault.

First of all, in what sense can it be said that our efforts to improve Ireland have failed? If the improvement of the condition of the people of Ireland was our only object, these efforts have not failed at all; on the contrary, they have ended in a very fair and reasonable degree of success. Nobody who has read the accounts given by Arthur Young a hundred years ago, and Edward Wakefield seventy years ago, or who has dipped ever so cursorily into the Reports of Parliamentary Committees up to our own time, can doubt that Ireland has advanced as far in proportion as other European communities. She was a century or more behind them. It might fairly be contended that the distance has decreased, and that Ireland is less backward in proportion to other communities than she was. I have already mentioned some of the things which English governments did for the good of Ireland, and I shall presently have occasion to mention more of the same kind. For the immediate end for which they were properly designed, these measures have not failed but have succeeded. If we were purely disinterested in our concern for the improvement of the conditions of life in Ireland, we should have

good reason to be fairly satisfied. As I have said, it is impossible for anybody to compare Arthur Young's account of Ireland with the most unfavourable account that could be written of it to-day, without perceiving that the growth of the population in some of the chief elements of intellectual and moral civilisation has been not only distinct and marked, but enormous. There are bad outrages still, but they are relatively few in number. In the over-populated districts of the West, the daily life is still hard, precarious, and barbarously squalid, but over the rest of Ireland the peasantry has been finally delivered from the serfage of a hundred years ago. The people are still ignorant and superstitious, but their contact with America has done even more than the schools, though these too have done much, in awakening them from the black mental torpor in which they had been plunged by the system of the Penal Laws. If we were mere spectators and were watching the fortunes of a country in which we had no direct concern, Englishmen would be the first to recognise in such a contrast as that between the Ireland of to-day and the Ireland of a hundred years ago striking evidence of social progress. Even that growth of national self-confidence, which is so inconvenient and so disgusting to us, might be taken by more impartial observers for a sign of vigour, and a promise of what may some day prove a healthy manhood. It is only a hundred years since Curran was thought a marvel of chivalry and boldness for daring to take a brief for a Roman Catholic clergyman. The priest had been presumptuous enough to bring an action against a peer who had violently assaulted him for refusing to withdraw certain ghostly censures that had been passed upon the brother of the peer's mistress. The oligarchy thought that the world was coming to an end when Curran won a verdict from a Protestant jury in favour of a Catholic priest against a Protestant nobleman. Is anybody sorry that all this has gone to the limbo of forgotten tyrannies? It is only a hundred years ago since that state of things existed which Macaulay once described to the House of Commons with an energy of language to which that House has long been a stranger. "Oppression and turbulence," he said, "reciprocally generated each other. The combination of rustic tyrants was resisted by gangs of rustic banditti. Courts of law and juries existed only for the benefit of the dominant sect. Those priests who were revered by millions as their natural advisers and guardians, as the only authorised expositors of Christian truth, as the only authorised dispensers of the Christian sacraments, were treated by the squires and squireens of the ruling faction as no good-natured man would treat the vilest beggar."¹ Nobody now regrets that so hateful a state of society has for ever passed away, and nobody who thinks it a good thing that nations should be raised from degradation

(1) Speech on the 'State of Ireland', February 19, 1844.

and tyrannical oppressions will be afraid to borrow Chatham's daring exclamation, to "rejoice that *Ireland* has resisted," and has by main force compelled England to come to her deliverance.

So far even in this sense there has been no failure. There has been progress in everything save in conciliation. We have endeavoured within the last fifty years to raise the level of Irish civilisation, and it has been raised palpably and undeniably. But then what has followed? Why, exactly that which might have been foreseen by any statesman or publicist who had learned the great and profound political lessons, that the most dangerous moment for a bad government is that at which it begins to reform; that the evil which people suffer patiently so long as it is inevitable, becomes unbearable the instant that they think they can throw it off; that the more abuses you remove, the more you expose the abuses that remain, and the more they will gall those who suffer from them; the evil has become less, but the sensibility is more keen.¹ This is precisely where we are in Ireland. If it had been possible for us to remain in the system of Ascendancy, governing Ireland by the Protestant garrison, keeping the Catholic mass of the population without civil or political rights, without a dream of Habeas Corpus, or Franchise, or Trial by Jury, we might have found ourselves to-day without an Irish Question. But this was not possible. What we have done has been to remove abuses enough to make the Irish more intent on the removal of the abuses that remain. The evils have diminished, but the sensibility has become keener.

V.

Our grand source of Irish unrest, and of the incessant and intolerable friction in Irish affairs, is that there have been no administrative changes to match the political changes. We have gradually admitted larger and larger masses of the Irish people to political power, but the system of Parliament at Westminster, and of centralised administration at the Castle in Dublin, has prevented them from using this power for any of the purposes which its possessors may happen to desire. We mock the Irish people with an invitation freely to exercise political rights, but we have never remodelled the legislative and executive machinery in such a way as to make their rights a practical reality.

From 1801 to 1809, that is to say from the Union down to Catholic Emancipation, the bulk of the population of Ireland was as much excluded from political power as the negroes on a cotton plantation in Virginia were excluded from it before the Civil War. One very small class governed all the rest of the nation. A few powerful noblemen managed the country, and what the executive had to do was to manage the powerful noblemen. In 1829 the great political

(1) Tocqueville's *Ancien Régime*, iii. iv.

revolution took place. Irishmen acquired full political and civil equality. Catholics and Protestants, landlords and tenants, were placed on the same footing, so far as an Act of Parliament could do it, in respect of their political rights and privileges. It is only fifty years since this vast change took place. If Ireland had been in the social condition of England the course of her progress during that time might have been one of orderly evolution. Irishmen, thus brought up to the same level, and relieved from the impediments of privilege of sect and class, would have settled down to work out their own problems. Why did they not? Why could they not? For one very good and sufficient reason, namely, that equality had not brought unity. Ireland was rent from top to bottom, not merely by differences of political opinion, but by differences of origin, of race, of religion, all exasperated to the highest pitch by a ferocious history and a vivid and ineffaceable tradition of mutual hatred. There was another circumstance which made these differences still more unmanageable. Ireland is a small country, and it is an island; and history only confirms what reflection might have led us to expect, when it shows us that the animosity of two factions is never so deadly as when they are locked up together in a small and isolated society.

This difficult state of things had been made still more difficult by the peculiar way in which, thanks to the religious bigotry and the political incompetency of the governing classes of that time in England, the revolution had been effected. The obstinate delay in conceding the claims of the Catholics had inflamed feeling on both sides to such a point that neither of them could be content with equality, but each was bent on retaining an unqualified ascendancy over the other. This was the reason why the British Government could not trust Irishmen to work out the policy of national unification for themselves. Classes were so broken up, so embittered against one another, that statesmen might well be pardoned for believing that the great changes which Catholic emancipation had necessitated throughout the whole system of Irish government, could only be safely brought about under the control of the central executive. The Government set to work with an energy that in itself, and judged by its motives alone, was truly admirable, to create or remodel the establishments that the country seemed to require. Tithes, parliamentary representation, municipal government were all dealt with in succession, while public works, railways, harbours, drainage, the navigation of rivers, were pushed forward with zealous activity. A Poor Law was established, and a system of education was established. Hospitals, asylums, and prisons were overhauled and reformed. Yet all this time the country was agitated by tithe wars, coercion acts, monster meetings, agitation for repeal, until the period ended in a great famine and a little rebellion. The tendency of what was attempted was no doubt in a small degree

to accustom people to the habit of working together for common objects, and with a common public interest. But there was a fatal blight over the whole scheme of policy. It was bureaucratic and centralised, as it is bureaucratic and centralised now. The concession of political equality was not accompanied by any of the realities of self-government. Nothing was done to meet the nationalist sentiment, within the limits in which nationalism is not treason but an honourable patriotism, just as defensible on grounds of sense and expediency, as of imagination and feeling.

Then another great political change was made in our own time. Political equality was more nominal than real, until the ballot released electors from the intimidation alike of the landlords and the priests. For the first time in their history the Irish people were able, by perfectly legal and constitutional means, to make themselves heard. Mr. Parnell taught them how to vex and harass the British Government, far more effectually than by rebellion. Whether we like it or not, however much we may protest, no matter how violently we may kick against the pricks, the Irish people have now got political power; they are beginning to learn—only beginning, for Mr. Parnell has only been in Parliament some six or seven years—how to use it, and English statesmen will henceforth have to deal with it, and make their account with it. We shall never again see one hundred and three gentlemen from Ireland sitting like cyphers in the House of Commons.

At present our system has reached the very height of what is absurd, inconsistent, and impracticable. You give the Irish a tolerably full right of popular representation in the imperial legislature. At the same time one branch of that legislature remains at liberty, and on system acts as if it were at liberty, to thwart and resist the wishes of the Irish representatives, even when, as in the case of the Land Question, they are practically unanimous in demanding legislative changes. In every measure that is framed its authors pay at least as much regard, and until the present year they paid much more regard, to the prejudices of the House of Lords as to the wishes and views of the whole body of Irish members. The corrective for this is not necessarily so drastic a measure as the abolition of the House of Lords; it is the growth of a tacit feeling in that body that the time has now come when to neglect the wishes and views of the Irish is as troublesome and as dangerous as they well know that it would be to neglect the wishes and views of the Scotch. You cannot give Ireland, you say, a separate national government of its own. Then the natural thing might be to try legislative independence. But there are reasons too against legislative independence. Then at least let the voice of the Irish members in Parliament be practically and virtually decisive in Irish affairs. Their first use of this new maxim, you say, would be to press for Home Rule.

But this is an English as well as an Irish affair, and we must have a full constitutional right under any system that can be framed to have a voice on such an issue as that. In Irish business, properly so called, all the principles of popular government point to the propriety of leaving it to the Irish members. In the case of the Land Bill itself, the present writer is not the only person who is firmly convinced, after a tolerably attentive observation of what has gone on, that if the whole body of Irish members had been sent up-stairs to work out a Land Bill of their own, whether at the initiative of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Plunket, or of Mr. Litton, Mr Shaw, and Mr. Parnell, they would in less time have produced a more effective, and possibly a more just measure than that which the collective wisdom of the two Houses will by-and-by send limping and halt-footed into the world.

Until some such system as this is adopted, either in set form and of deliberate institution, or by one of those tacit and unwritten conventions in which our constitutional practice abounds, a continuance of the present friction is inevitable. The Irish are now strong enough to hold their own, or rather they are strong enough to torment us, and to put a block on all English business, until we give them in reality that control over their own affairs, that voice in the settlement of their own concerns, to which they are in theory and in name entitled already.

VI.

It will not be enough to give the Irish the reality of political power at Westminster. They must have more of this power and equality at home. No English politician has paid a closer attention to Irish questions than the present Under-Secretary for Home Affairs, though his conclusions on some of them, the question of Coercion for instance, do not commend themselves to the present writer. Speaking to his constituents at Liskeard a year and a half ago, Mr. Courtney said :—

“The thing that I wish to speak about, is the reform of local Government in Ireland. You know that we have had a good deal of agitation about county government in England. In England it is a theoretical principle. Many of us would wish to see large reforms introduced into it; but county government in England is perfection compared with what it is in Ireland. The counties of Ireland are governed by the grand juries of Ireland selected in the most extraordinary and inexplicable manner, and endowed with powers much greater than those possessed by English county magistrates assembled in Quarter Sessions. If we could get a system of county government in Ireland you would satisfy that demand for management of their local affairs which lies at the root of the cry for Home Rule, and take the whole sting out of the agitation by granting to the Home Rulers that which they have a legitimate claim to ask. We should be able to say to them, ‘Manage your own county affairs to the full, if you like,’ and I will tell you how we could do it. In my opinion a

comprehensive and liberal scheme of county government might be introduced in Ireland. This might appear to be entering into a small matter, but if you will grant me your patience for a minute or two you will see that I am leading up to something of considerable importance. I would have, then, a County Parliament in each county in Ireland elected by representatives of each Barony, which corresponds to each hundred in England—a free election of several members of each Barony with a cumulative vote, and the result would be a County Parliament bearing great power and great authority as representatives of the rate-payers and inhabitants of the county, and to that County Parliament I would give most ample power of regulating very many matters which at present we have to deal with in the House of Commons, and very unsatisfactorily. In a word I will tell you one very great question which I would give to the management of County Parliaments in Ireland—and by-and-by to County Parliaments in England when we get such Parliaments in the English counties—and that is, subject to certain general restrictions, the management of the liquor traffic in each county.”¹

A discussion which is going on at this moment in some of the Irish newspapers, accompanying a debate in the Irish General Assembly, illustrates “the extraordinary and inexplicable manner” in which the local governing authorities in Ireland are chosen. It is found that Protestant Episcopalians in the three counties of Antrim, Down, and Derry, enjoy the distinction and power of the magistracy almost to the exclusion of the members of every other body. The Presbyterian population in Antrim is 122,918.² But there are only twelve Presbyterian magistrates in the county. There are in the county 55,640 Roman Catholics. They have only five magistrates. The Protestant Episcopalians number only 45,670—that is, they are numerically fewer than the Roman Catholics, and scarcely more than a third of the Presbyterians. But they have not fewer than 105 magistrates. In County Down the statistics show the same result. The Protestant Episcopalians are the smallest of the three denominations, much less than the Roman Catholics, and little more than half the number of the Presbyterians. But they have, with few exceptions, the full representation on the bench of magistrates. In the County of Derry there are 20,079 Protestant Episcopalians to 58,779 Presbyterians, and 77,358 Roman Catholics. But the Protestant Episcopalians have there ninety magistrates, the Presbyterians eleven, and the Roman Catholics seven.³

From a political point of view, the conclusion is much the same. The Liberal magistrates in the three counties may be reckoned on the fingers: the Conservatives generally can be represented by three figures. Yet the elections show that the party which thus has something like a practical monopoly of magisterial authority is numerically the smallest. The significance of all this is pointed out

(1) November 29, 1878.

(2) These are the figures before the new Census.

(3) *Belfast Northern Whig*, June 16.

by the journal from which the figures are taken. "That this one-sided system causes much discontent is beyond all doubt. It is easy to say that the Protestant Episcopalians are the majority of the landowners and of the land agents, and that the representation on the bench of magistracy ought to be, as it has been, associated with the land. This is, however, just admitting the grievance in another form. It is the foundation of all the unfairness of the present Grand Jury system. It is not right, it cannot be right, that a minority of the population should almost exclusively monopolize the honours of the Crown, administer justice to people of opposite religious and political opinions, and thus very often be judges in their own causes. The evil exists. It is not denied. A remedy for it in one form or another ought to be found. In an effective measure for a reform of the Grand Juries, and in a good County Government Bill, such as was announced at the beginning of this Session in the Speech from the Throne, some means ought to be devised for taking these nominations out of the hands of the Lord Lieutenants of counties in a country situated as Ireland now is."

VII.

The English are astonished and indignant to read of the Irish being attracted by a Republic, and they detest an insult added to an injury in the fact that the Fenians should, of all things in the world, take the style and title of a Republican Brotherhood. We forget how little trouble has been taken to attract the Irish to a monarchy. We are always being told, when this question is discussed, that monarchy in a modern state, apart from its convenience as a political arrangement, depends on a personal sentiment, on an almost domestic feeling of attachment to the person and family of the sovereign. But can this sentiment be expected to spring up towards a sovereign who is never seen, who does not live in the country, who never visits it, who shows no more consciousness of its special existence than of the special existence of Heligoland, or Barbadoes, or the Fiji Islands? Everyone knows how infinitely, in Great Britain itself, the monarchy is strengthened by the personal presence of the Queen, and her sons and daughters; by the constant series of acts of modest state, engaging the interest of the crowd; by the goings and comings of a decorous Court, stirring the friendly curiosity of simple folk; by the busy graciousness which brings it to pass that almost the humblest provincial town is able to make sure for its bazaars, cattle shows, foundations, inaugurations, of the attendance of a prince or a princess at the ceremony. There are those who look with stern contempt on all this as unworthy, as marking a lower type of national life, as degrading the self-respect of citizenship, as engendering flunkeyism, snobbery, and a whole troop of the most despicable, unmanly, and enervating social

meanness. This is what we are not now concerned to discuss. We are only describing an actual state of things, and no more words need be used to show that the personal presence of the sovereign in the country, and the active participation of her family in the minor business and the amusements of the people, could not be spared if the monarchy is to stand. Such things make all the difference. If Queen Victoria were to withdraw from this country, say to Ottawa or Melbourne, as some of her ancestors used to threaten to withdraw to Hanover, how much longer does anybody think that British loyalty would last? Then why do you expect this sort of loyalty from Ireland? Yet here is a race which, as we are constantly told, is susceptible, before all other races, of personal attachment, of devotion to individuals, of passionate loyalty to anyone who by office or character touches its imagination and sentiment, and which, before all other races, is only inclined to respect an institution which it has some excuse for worshipping in a person. The one part of the three kingdoms where the royal family might do most real and substantial good to the union of the realm, is exactly that to which as it seems no Minister ventures to urge that they ought to go.

It is a curious and most fatal paradox that in this as in all things Englishmen demand that Ireland, though the most backward of the three kingdoms, shall rise to heights of virtue which the other two, in spite of their superior advancement, have not hitherto come near to attaining. What is too severe and rigorous for ourselves we expect without a murmur from Ireland. In England and Scotland the strongest sect is established and endowed; Ireland alone, where the population is poorest and where the ministers of religion would be the most invaluable auxiliaries of the State, we leave to the austerities of voluntarism. In England and Scotland we cherish our denominational system of education and bolster it with grants; in Ireland alone, where they need the higher education most sorely, we say that they shall have no aid from us unless it be strictly undenominational. In England and Scotland, believed to be the very homes of prosaic common sense, every pains is taken, and taken on system, to stir the interest and attachment of the nation towards the throne; in Ireland, on the other hand, inhabited by what is believed to be the most imaginative portion of our mixed population, we are most careful to avoid doing anything that would touch the imagination. We cannot even indulge it in the cheap and harmless form of the pageantry of a Court. There is a Court at Dublin, no doubt, but it is not the Court of the Sovereign for one thing, and for another thing, it is the Court of the official and actual head and representative of that centralised executive government which the whole nation views with especial dislike and distrust. If it be true then, as we are so often assured, that the Irishman is a peculiarly sensitive and imaginative creature, all that can be said is that our political arrangements do not seem excellently

well fitted to suit his temperament. There he finds himself in his squalid and melancholy island, bullied and lectured by the serious press of his foreign masters, brutally insulted and caricatured by their comic press, surrounded by stipendiary magistrates, soldiers, and constabulary, the most important public work done, not by local bodies whom he has helped to choose, but by all sorts of bureaucratic Boards; neglected by great ministers and high personages of State, his memory darkened by the visions of a sombre historic past, the destiny of his country held in the grasp of a foreign nation whom he hates,—is there a drearier figure to be found in any civilised country in the world?

VIII.

There is, indeed, an alternative course to such a line of policy as Fox propounded, which a great many people just now seem to find conceivable. Ireland may be converted from a free and integral part of the United Kingdom into a Crown Colony. The proposal runs very glibly from the tongue, but let us see what it would mean. A Crown Colony is a dependency in which the Crown has the entire control of legislation, while the administration is carried on by public officers under the direction of the Home Government. It has neither representative institutions nor responsible government. It is the lowest type of the classes into which our colonial system is divided. The Irish people would lose all voice in their own concerns as completely as the people of Madras or Bengal. They would be held down by a strong army. Trial by jury would pretty certainly disappear, and some Vernacular Press Act would warn the newspapers not to transgress the bounds of what the official authorities might think legitimate criticism. Public meetings would be sharply watched, and too bold a speaker would finish his peroration in prison. There would, we presume, be some sort of advising Council, but it would of course be nominated by the Crown and subject to the approval of the Secretary of State. It could only be chosen from the Rump of the old party of Ascendancy, because no member of the popular or national party could possibly consent to hold office in so anti-popular and so anti-national a system. The new Government would become absolutely responsible for the entire administration of the country, and might expect to receive about as much help from the inhabitants in the task as Austrians received from Italians, and Russians from Poles. With sufficient display of military energy, we do not doubt that every germ of self-government in Ireland might be satisfactorily crushed, and still the taxes would be regularly collected, civil suits duly heard, and prisoners judicially tried. In some respects the population might possibly improve under this iron system, but we may as well remember that if this improvement included any advance in intelligence, knowledge, moral elevation, then the more

you improve them, the more ardently will they desire their freedom. The deliverance of his country would be the one aspiration of every generous and enlightened spirit. In these aspirations he would have, and he would be stimulated by the knowledge that he had, the sympathy and admiration of the whole civilised world. The Catholic Clergy, who could not now accept the endowments that a rational policy would have bestowed upon them at the Union, would from the first throw all their weight upon the popular side, and would without ceasing fan the flame of national sentiment. Meanwhile, we all know what would be going on in England. The Secretary of State for Ireland would be as responsible to Parliament as the Secretary of State for India. Representatives from constituencies in Ireland would, it is true, no longer be able to harass him, and it is even possible that no Irishman would be returned for a constituency in Great Britain. But Ireland is a great deal too near for its pettiest grievances as well as its greatest not to be heard at Westminster. We cannot stifle the voice of a population that has two mails a day to London. Who does not foresee the endless stream of deputations, petitions, questions, keeping Ireland as incessantly before Parliament as now, and with a still more inexorable persistency? If there were no House of Commons, the system might work, but it is not proposed, we imagine, to make Great Britain also a Crown Colony. It is mere madness to dream that a free and popular government can work a despotism in a country that is only twelve hours from its own door; that has once been as free and as popular in constitution as itself; and that has hundreds of its people in the very midst of its masters. Supposing that Ireland were in some moment of passionate infatuation on the part of England to be degraded into a Crown Colony, how long would it be before a great wave of reaction would awaken the national conscience (or the national weakness and sentimentality if you please to call it so), and would sweep away the whole barbarous and mistimed fabric? If I believed separation to be the desirable end of the eternal Irish question, I should wish for nothing so strongly as the interlude of a Crown Colony, for nothing would be so surely the precursor of Irish independence. But the whole speculation is absurd and impotent. Freedom has no doubt multiplied our difficulties for the time. But the same may be said of our plans for teaching the Irish how to read and write. They might perhaps, as has been already said, be much more easily governed if they had been kept in ignorance, and if it had been made penal, as it was in the Southern States, to teach our slaves their letters. But we cannot thrust back into ignorance a nation that has once tasted knowledge. It is exactly as impracticable for such a country as England to thrust back under the sullen hand of despotism a nation that has in ever so imperfect a form tasted political liberty.

EDITOR.

ÂTMAN.

I.

Sous mon voile que nul ne perce
Le nom de l'Infini se tait.
Dans mon immensité se berce
Tout ce qui naît, meurt et renaît.
Je sens passer la vie humaine
Ainsi qu'un vent dans les roseaux,
Et je me pare de la chaîne
Dont les âmes sont les anneaux.

II.

Les ans tombent au fond des âges
Sans que je m'en sois aperçu.
Indra chevauchant les nuages
Me fait l'effet d'un parvenu.
Pour moi dans l'éternelle danse
Les jours de Brahmâ sont des pas ;
J'en sais la fin et la naissance. . . .
Si ce n'est que je ne sais pas.

III.

Pourtant sur la mer de ce monde
L'homme dans son essor fatal,
Nocher aveugle, vogue et sonde,
Ayant le doute pour fanal,
Et, doux ou fier, humble ou farouche,
Dans son image fait son dieu,
Ne songeant pas que de ma bouche
Un souffle finirait le jeu.

IV.

Fils de l'homme, veux-tu te faire
Calme et puissant, ton prêtre et roi ?
Plane sans crainte dans ma sphère,
Où l'on ne dit plus *toi* ni *moi*.
Du secret tu seras le maître
Que tu cherchais en gémissant ;
C'est que, pour arriver à l'Être,
Il faut passer par le Néant.

V.

Quand le désir et l'ignorance
N'auront plus de tes sens la clé,
Quand tu verras la différence
Se fondre dans mon unité,
Quand de ta raison l'équilibre
Ne connaîtra ni temps ni lieu,
Alors tu seras fort et libre,
Alors tu seras plus qu'un dieu.

FREDERICK POLLOCK.

ITALY ; HER HOME AND FOREIGN POLICY.

It is surprising to see how little charity there is among men ; how unable or unwilling we are to make allowance for the circumstances by which our neighbours are swayed ; how often we grudge common justice even though we profess exaggerated partiality.

The best-abused nations in Europe at this moment are those which the general consent and deliberate act of the European States combined to recall from political death to life—the Roumans, the Bulgarians, and other Wallach or Slavic races ; but more especially the modern representatives of those two great races of antiquity—the Hellenes and the Latins. Few of us remember how harshly men's judgment had for centuries, and till very recent times, gone against those fallen people ; how persistently Greeks and Italians were looked upon as “ degenerate bastards ; the mere dust of the noble generations on whose graves they trod ; the maggots,” to quote the expression of a crabbed German, “ claiming descendance from the lion's carcass, out of whose putrefaction they swarmed.” Few of us recollect how often it was asserted that the Turk or the Austrian was “ too good for them ;” how expedient it was that they should bear their yoke till, forsooth, “ slavery should ripen them for self-government.”

But they had not to wait so long as that ; their valour or despair, their good fortune or the interested policy of the Great Powers, wrought out their deliverance ; Greeks and Italians were allowed the free guidance of their own destinies, and forthwith our expectations transcended all limits of reason. We looked for an immediate revival of heroic races ; for a reproduction of the deeds and thoughts of ancient Athens, or Sparta, or Rome ; and now, because stubborn reality does not come up to our ideal, we fall back on our fathers' ungenerous views, and look upon those “ half-emancipated bondsmen ”

as "corrupt and debased past recovery." We lament our ill-bestowed sympathies, and almost wish our work undone.

Leaving the Greeks to plead their own cause as they can, I shall venture, as an Italian, to assert that my countrymen might be entitled to a little more consideration where they so long met with so much indulgence. I shall attempt an apology of that long-enthralled nation, which seems daily to sink in the estimation of those who had perhaps too great a pity on its durance, and who also, perhaps, too hastily and too loudly applauded its release.

There are few words better deserving to be treasured up, with respect to Italy, than those which fell from Massimo d'Azeglio, when, amidst the first exultation of the meeting of an Italian Parliament in Turin, in 1860, he exclaimed—" *L'Italia è fatta, ma chi farà ora gl'Italiani.*" D'Azeglio, both the warmest-hearted and the coolest-headed of Italian patriots, well knew by what long and painful stages freedmen must rise to the dignity of freemen. Had the emancipation of the Peninsula been the result of a few years' struggle with Austria, or, if need were, with the whole world, the energies called forth by a sustained action would have brought forth a new race, as it happened in Switzerland at the rise of the Forest Cantons, or in Italy itself at the epoch of the Lombard League of the twelfth century. But the Italy of our days was not—fortunately, as some people think—sufficiently tempered by the fire of adversity. She came too easily through the ordeal of 1859; she fought but little in that year; she fought again in 1866, and not victoriously. She won by defeat. The generation of "patriots," "rebels," or "conspirators," as men may prefer to call them, who gave their blood, their homes, or their fortunes for their country's cause, is rapidly dying away, and a new set of mere "politicians" has sprung up, who seem to look upon the long trials Italy had to go through as a mere myth, and laugh to scorn the idea of a possibility of their recurrence. They do not inquire by what virtues or by what chances their country became their own; they do not expect to be called upon to produce their title deeds. It is their country, of course. "Italy for the Italians!" as good a cry as France for the French, or Denmark for the Danes. They would probably be surprised to hear that, less than thirty years ago, grave statesmen only spoke of Italy as of a "geographical expression."

This consciousness, natural to the Italians, that they have a country of their own—a country formerly the greatest and perhaps still the most beautiful—too readily suggests the notion that it should at once take rank among the strongest, and induces them to assume an attitude which is resented by their neighbours as provocative and aggressive, and which might cause some uneasiness, were it not for that unerring political instinct common to all Italians

which makes them feel when they are getting into a scrape, and advises a timely retreat out of any dangerous path into which fond conceit might beguile them.

From the fact, for instance, that they have made good their claims to their country springs the corollary that they have a right to the whole of it. Hence the outcry for those "unredeemed" districts on the frontiers of the Tyrol or Istria, of the Canton Ticino, of the Maritime Alps, and the islands of Corsica and Malta, which would seem at any moment likely to involve the Italians in hostilities with Austria, Switzerland, France, and England. Hence, again, from the idea that they are a great nation, one of the "Six Powers," and, as such, interested in maintaining the equilibrium between the European States, arise the pretensions of the Italians, that anything that might disturb that balance, any aggrandisement by which one State might threaten to sink the scale on one side—as, for example, Austria's annexation of Bosnia, or France's *coup de main* upon Tunis—should, by way of compensation and counterpoise, justify Italy's demand for a corresponding territorial increase on the other side.

These covetous aspirations, natural and common to every family as to every individual of the human species, find an easy vent in Italy—a country where opinion has been made free even to license—in the vapouring declamations of stump orators, and in the vaunting effusions of farthing prints; but they are promptly, eagerly, and sincerely disavowed by responsible statesmen in and out of power, and hushed up by the authority of their official or semi-official organs: not because the Italians, as a people, have any doubt of the justice or reasonableness of their national claims, but because there is wisdom enough among them to understand how hopeless it is for the frog to swell himself to the size of an ox, and how little profitable to the dog to bark if he has no fangs to bite. No chauvinism in a young thin-skinned Southern community is proof against the withering blast of ridicule.

The Italians, in sober moments, are well aware that hardly any continental State may be said to be circumscribed within what are called natural frontiers; that every kingdom or empire has within its boundary, as every landed proprietor within his ring-fence, some petty *enclave* or debatable border-district, some Naboth's vineyard, which gold cannot purchase and force cannot seize, without undergoing heavier sacrifices or incurring greater risks than the longed-for prize would be worth. The Italians see, wherever they look, instances of great Powers, such as England, Germany, or Russia, falling back from pretensions, submitting to arbitrations, accepting compromises, and even putting up with affronts, for the sake of that peace which is a common necessity; and how could the conviction of this necessity, this amiable disposition to mutual forbearance, to timely

concession, to a give-and-take policy, not be forced upon a new State, whose walls and bulwarks are barely rising, whose solidity, it must be avowed, withstood but indifferently the first trial to which it was exposed?

For, undoubtedly, at the bottom of all the uneasiness, of the jealous, exacting sensitiveness evinced by the Italians in all matters concerning their position in the European concert, there rankles the recollection of their defeats of Custoza and Lissa. Their instinct tells them that the first claim an untried nation like Italy may put forth to the consideration of her neighbours must rest on her character as a fighting nation. She may never have an occasion to put forth her strength; she will be praised and loved for her pacific disposition; but, all the same, the world must be sure that, though she "beware of entrance to a quarrel, she will, being in, bear it that her opposer may beware of her." She must fight if need be, and not only bravely, but victoriously; for little will it avail her to blame either her soldiers or her generals, or ill-fortune for her reverses; it is only success, no matter how won, that will make her neighbours seek her as an ally or dread her as an adversary.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt to persuade the Italians that they can never have a war except of their own seeking, or that a war provoked by them can never turn out to their advantage. It would be idle to repeat to them that the "barbarians," who have for so many centuries used Italy for their cockpit, have had enough of a country which has almost invariably become their cemetery. No argument could prove to the Italians' satisfaction that their only safety lies in a policy of absolute neutrality; their real strength in a military organization based on the Swiss system, which should reduce the standing army to a minimum, and muster the whole population into militia regiments and rifle companies. It is all in vain! Italy cannot be reassured on the score of her neighbours' attitude. Till they all agree on some scheme of simultaneous disarmament, Italy will go on adding cannon to cannon, man-of-war to man-of-war. Though France fought at Magenta and Solferino for the Italians, she has never concealed her desire to undo the work that those two battles accomplished—a work the result of which went so far beyond her calculations or intentions—she has never lost an opportunity of humiliating them or working them mischief. Witness her mediation at Venice, the wonders of her chassepots at Mentana, her recent campaign at Tunis. France, the Italians think, hates them with the lingering, undying hatred, not of him who received, but of him who inflicted an injury. Of course the Italians are aware that their country never could, single-handed, be a match for France. But they reckon on the chapter of accidents; they look upon war between the Great Powers as an inevitable and not remote

contingency; and, following the traditional policy which has for so many centuries and so well answered the purposes of "plucky little Piedmont"—the policy which won for them Solferino, Sadowa, and Sedan—they trust that in the next war they may, by being well armed, still be able to sell their co-operation or inaction to the highest bidder, so as, either as auxiliaries or neutrals, to come in for a share of the gains of the chief combatants.

That such calculations are ignoble, that such a policy would be undignified, and lower their country to the position of the jackal among European lions, the Italians must readily acknowledge. But they plead necessity as their excuse. As it was said of the Princes of Savoy, "*La géographie les empêche d'être honnêtes gens.*" The Italians conceive that no pacific attitude, no declaration of non-interference on their part, would ward off those calamities of invasion from which their fertile plains have so often suffered. It ought to be sufficient for Europe, they argue, that Italy will never voluntarily be the cause of an outbreak or give the signal for it. But if her good-will avails not, if she must needs be dragged into the *mêlée*, it would be too much to pretend that she should suffer events to find her unprepared, unable not only to hold her own, but also to make the most of other people's necessities, or to turn their errors or their mishaps to account. Italy cannot hope to exist on mere sufferance. Her protection from attack lies on her ability, or simply on the reputation of her ability, to defend herself. Such is the argument on the Italians' side, and they clench it with their proverb, "*Colui che si fa peccora il lupo se la mangia.*"

Unfortunately, as we have seen, Italy can put but little reliance on her military reputation. Ask a French or a German general, and he will tell you that he would feel less confident of success in an encounter with a mere handful of sturdy mountaineers of the Swiss cantons than in an inroad into Italy with her half-million combatants; and this because the Swiss have on their side the prestige of Sempach, Morgarten, Grandson, Marignano, whilst, from the days of Fornovo, in 1495, to those of Custoza, in 1866, all the battles fought by the Italians as a nation have been inglorious disasters. Not but the Italians have on many an occasion proved themselves good soldiers. Not but Spinola, Farnese, Montecuccoli, and others, have taken high rank among generals; but, somehow or other, either soldiers or generals have been at fault. There has always been something deficient in the organization or discipline of an Italian army. It was only as generals at the head of alien soldiers, or as soldiers serving under alien generals, that the Italians very frequently behaved with honour. "Conquering or vanquished, always to be enslaved," was the fate of the country.

The force that the Italians have now at their disposal is numerous,

well armed and equipped; it shows to advantage on parade; it is well-behaved; a model of subordination and discipline. But the proof of an army is in the battle; and how can one answer for its conduct in the field, if it numbers very few officers and hardly any of the rank and file who have ever seen fire? The Italians take no little pride in the exploits of their troops at Palestro and San Martino; but the men engaged in these encounters were not pure Italians. One half of the Piedmontese army consisted of Savoyards, the other half chiefly of sub-alpine mountaineers, men tempered by the nature of their rugged soil and climate, and whose bravery never belied itself in the best or worst times of their connection with the Savoy dynasty. Out of these and of their Lombard brethren, and from the whole valley of the Po between the Alps and the Apennines, recruits available for good work may always be drawn; but these were already in the minority at Custozza. The greatest number of the Italian army has to be made up of Southern men, Tuscans, Romans, and Neapolitans, available also, but not without long training and very firm discipline. Out of Piedmont, for a period of three centuries, every effort was made by Italian rulers to unstring the nerves and break the spirit of the Italian nation. Those were the days when at Naples men heard a brute of a king, himself a coward, boasting, with his *Fuggiranno sempre*, of the cowardice of his soldiers. The slaves of a tyrant can never be cowardly enough to reassure their master's fears. But now the times are changed. Italy has a manly race of sovereigns at her head, and every effort should be made to reawaken the manliness of a naturally soft and indolent, but not irretrievably debased population. Unfortunately, what has been attempted hitherto has met with but indifferent results. The rifle-clubs and shooting-galleries, opened with great eagerness in the towns of the Peninsula on the first outburst of patriotic enthusiasm in 1859, were either closed or abandoned in most instances not many years after their inauguration. Athletic sports, walking tours, alpine climbing, boating and riding, are diversions in which few Italians take pleasure; and, since the introduction of the Prussian system of universal enlistment, the Italians seem to think that a soldier's training need only be applied to the conscript or recruit, while in Germany and everywhere in the North it is with the schoolboy that the physical and moral discipline of the future soldier begins.

But even supposing that by proper management an Italian army could be made to reach the highest degree of efficiency, and that it had at its back, as a Reserve, Landwehr, and Landsturm, the whole regenerated nation, there would always remain the question of the "sinews of war" to be settled; and the finances of the Italian kingdom have been from the beginning in so deplorable a condition,

that it would be under present circumstances the height of madness to take the field, as it would require superhuman efforts to maintain it. The military establishment of Italy began to weigh as an intolerable incubus on the national exchequer at the time that the Minghetti administration borrowed 300,000,000 francs in one lump to make ready for the final contest with Austria in 1866. The annexation of Venetia at that juncture was considered a matter of life and death, and no sacrifice by which the means to reach that end could be procured was then deemed too enormous. But the end was compassed; Venice was won, and not much later Rome, and yet Italy went on adding year after year to her war budget, as if what had been deemed sufficient for the requirements of an active war were no longer adequate to the exigencies of an armed peace. And matters have been carried so far that, even now, when the Tunis difficulty, which threatened to lead to a quarrel with France, was brought to an end by an arrangement in which Italy had *nolens volens* to acquiesce, we hear of a popular War Minister, General Mezzacapo, in the recent Cabinet crisis, declining to take office, because his colleagues grudged him a sum of 400,000,000 francs to be laid out by instalments of 10,000,000 francs to 30,000,000 francs yearly, necessary, in the General's opinion, to "complete the supply and equipment of the army; as more than half the cavalry are badly mounted, the batteries incomplete, and in short the army in many respects wholly unfurnished."

It would be to little purpose to assert that, madly extravagant as the military and naval establishment of Italy may be said to be, its expenditure still falls considerably short of the War and Marine Budgets of England, France, and other States, bearing in mind the different ratio of their respective populations. For the army of a nation should be proportionate not to the number of its inhabitants, but to the extent of its financial resources: the suit of armour should be so contrived as to protect without crushing the body that has to wear it. And Italy cannot afford to keep in her pay even an army of half the numerical strength of France or England, unless she can also muster at least half the wealth of either of those two countries. But it is quite certain that Italy does not find herself in such conditions. Italy is comparatively a poor country, and her poverty in a great measure arises not only from the extravagance, but also from the defective administration of the military and naval as well as of most other departments of the public service.

The kingdom of Italy has been in existence for more than a score of years. During this period it has received a momentous impulse in every branch of public works, in popular education, in the development of its agricultural and industrial resources; and there has been to all appearance so rapid and extensive an increase of national

prosperity, that, while the public expenditure has been more than doubled, the revenue has ultimately been made to keep pace with it. This result has, however, not been obtained without a dire strain on the blood and substance of the people, from whom loud complaints arise that they have to bear burdens exceeding their powers of endurance. The Italians, indeed, seem to have survived the worst times, as, owing to the propitious circumstances of a long-continued European peace, and a succession of abundant harvests, the well-being of the nation has been deemed so perceptible as to encourage the Government to propose the abolition of the unpopular grist tax, and of the irksome circulation of the forced paper currency. But there is little expectation of a speedy removal of other taxes, as objectionable as these—improvident taxes, falling with ruthless severity on the necessities of life, and weighing especially on the lower orders, such as the salt and tobacco monopoly, the *octroi*, or duty on consumption at the town gates—immoral taxes, tending to encourage the gambling propensities of the multitude, such as the public lottery—taxes absorbing nearly half the income of real property, such as the house tax, which in some of the towns—in Florence, for instance—amounts to 49 per cent. of the estimated rent; finally, taxes on mere expectations, as the legacy duty, which is equally exacted from an heir upon immediate succession, or upon the reversion of a legacy which may not fall due for an indefinite number of years. Add to all this a Customs tariff virtually amounting to prohibition, and port duties and other navigation laws, the effect of which has been greatly to diminish both the number and tonnage of the mercantile marine.

That private fortunes should be made subservient to the interests of the public income is sufficiently clear; still we must not be unmindful of the plain rules of common sense about “the feather that breaks the camel’s back,” and the inexpediency of “killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.” The results of excessive taxation in Italy are perceptible in the slow progress of public works, in the stagnation of trade and industry, but, above all things, in the cruel sufferings of the lower classes, especially among the rural population. Nowhere, perhaps, does the unmatched fertility of the soil offer a more striking contrast with the wretchedness of its cultivators than in those rich Lombard and Emilian plains, where the *Pellagra*, a mysterious but horrible complaint, affecting both body and mind, is bred from the insufficient quantity or bad quality of food, from the squalor of the dwellings, the impurity of the waters; from a complication of evils all springing from the same source of abject poverty; the low wages being equally insufficient to enable a labourer to keep body and soul together in his native land, or to better his condition by quitting it. It is but justice to inquire whether such miseries

did not exist in those same regions of Italy in former times ; and whether, if we hear more about them now, it is not simply because greater attention is being paid to the subject, and somewhat more earnest efforts are made to point out the evil and devise its remedy. Whether the pellagra is on the increase, or whether it abates ; whether the emigration which has lately set in in vast proportions from many Italian provinces, is to be accounted gain or loss for the community, are all matters about which discussion is not easy. One ought to be thankful to the Italian Government for its activity in supplying statistical information on these and other subjects, and trust to publicity and the natural progress of reason and humanity to force both the Government itself and the wealthier classes to come to the relief of the helpless lower orders.

A nation which has been as long aspiring to the dignity of self-government as Italy must not only be willing to pay the costs of so great a privilege, but also be able to exercise a proper control over such expenses. It must feel that it is responsible for the management of its own affairs, and should not intrust it to incompetent or unscrupulous public servants. The Italians were called upon to exercise freemen's rights and fulfil freemen's duties upon little or no preparation. Their constitution of 1848 grew up like the Prophet's gourd in one night, a mere copy of the French charter of Louis Philippe, which the revolution at that very moment was tearing to tatters. In spite of its many theoretical faults and practical inconveniences, the Italians wisely put up with it, partly because no provisions are made by the Act itself for its revision, and partly also because they are aware that a constituent assembly would be in Italy as dangerous an experiment as it has almost invariably been elsewhere. The Electoral law, however, is a separate enactment ; it has none of the irrevocable stability of the fundamental statute. There have been frequent attempts to amend it ; and the Chamber of Deputies is even now discussing a Bill brought in by the Government for its radical reform, and aiming at the establishment of the broadest manhood suffrage.

For a period of sixteen years after the inauguration of the first Italian Parliament, in 1860, the Italian Government was in the hands of Cavour and of the statesmen of his school, Ricasoli, Sella, Minghetti, &c.—the " Right," or Moderate Liberal or Conservative party, who, all engrossed with the fulfilment of the country's emancipation by the deliverance of Venice and Rome, were inclined to adjourn any rash modification of mere political institutions. But in 1876, in consequence of some petty or personal questions, the Minghetti administration collapsed ; and the Left or former Rattazzi party, headed by Depretis, Cairoli, Crispi, Nicotera, &c., came into power. It was an amalgam of more or less advanced democrats, some of

whom, when in opposition, had committed themselves to ultra-radical principles and measures, specious perhaps in theory, but fraught with insurmountable difficulties in their practical application. Moderate and Radical politicians in Italy both borrow their ideas from the French; and none of these ideas had struck deeper roots among the men of the Extreme Left than that of the utmost extension of the electoral franchise, and that of a revision of the Penal Code, aiming at the mitigation of its severity, and the eventual abolition of capital punishment. On these subjects, however, it was no easy matter for the governing party to bring about an agreement among the various sections of which it is composed; and it found it still more difficult to satisfy the ambition, or overcome the hostility of the section leaders, especially Nicotera and Crispi, by allowing them as high a place in the Government as they considered themselves entitled to. The consequence was that the Government of the Left, in spite of its very large majority, was from the beginning a house divided against itself; and, as such, exposed to disastrous defeats, leading to very frequent ministerial crises, in which the Cabinet almost entirely consisted of the same men, but with the alternate appearance of Depretis or Cairoli, Cairoli or Depretis, as President of the Council or Prime Minister. For, on the one hand, the Democratic majority was always sufficiently united to stand its ground against all opposition whenever any dangers arose of a triumph of the Right likely to bring back that party into power; and, on the other hand, success in the Chambers was of no avail to the leaders of the Left, as they well knew that almost in any measure they proposed they would be forsaken by some of their discordant sections, which for this special purpose would have no scruple about turning against the Government and making common cause with its adversaries.

There is thus, properly speaking, no Government in Italy, and the whole home policy of the country is in an *impasse*. It is not so much as rash and dangerous innovators that the men of the Left have hitherto been able to do mischief. The evil has rather arisen from their impotence, from their want of capacity as well as of unity of purpose. For after the death of the rather tricky than clever Rattazzi, the Radicals have always been a headless party, as all, or very nearly all, the able men of the Chamber have for the last sixteen years been sitting on the Right or Right Centre, as supporters of the Moderate Government, leaving the opposite benches to mere mediocrities like Depretis, to well-meaning but inexperienced patriots like Cairoli, or to hot-headed agitators like Nicotera and Crispi. The Left during their six years' tenure of office have simply done nothing in a country where there was, and is, and will for a long time be so much to be done; a country where the administration in all its branches is still in the utmost disorder, in which crime of the most

appalling frequency and atrocity is still rampant, and where, while in too many cases the police suffer the worst malefactors to elude their vigilance and baffle pursuit, the judges, with their unconscionable delays and tedious proceedings, too often doom an innocent man to languish in jail month after month, year after year, in some instances even prolonging his suspense till death comes to his relief before they vouchsafe him his trial.

Of the measures on the passing of which the men of the Left staked their existence on coming into power six years ago, only the two financial schemes already mentioned—the grist tax and the Forced Paper Currency—are now in progress of execution. About the success of their trump-card—the Electoral Reform, which is now the theme of debate in the Chambers—great doubts are still entertained; and yet it is on the alleged necessity of getting at the real will of the nation that King Humbert, with honourable but somewhat exaggerated ideas of his duties as a Constitutional Sovereign, resisted, during the recent crisis, all suggestions about dissolving the Chamber of Deputies, putting off all appeal to the people till the present Legislature is brought to its natural close, or till the question of the electoral franchise is decided. Everybody about the King, though perhaps not the King himself, well knows how little reliance can be put on the results of a general election. In a country so new as Italy is to constitutional life, the popular vote is either unduly swayed by the ascendancy of the Government functionaries, high and low, or actually hocus-pocussed and falsified by the sleight-of-hand tricks of its underhand agents. At any rate, it very seldom happens on the Continent that a majority is returned hostile to the Government which manipulates the election. And it is in this respect that Democrats in those Southern communities have succeeded in perverting the ideas of the unthinking multitude: they contend that in their scheme of universal suffrage and the ballot lies the panacea for all electoral disorders. Some of the Conservatives, however, if they would speak out, might object that the electoral franchise, far from needing extension, ought on the contrary to be limited, at least until the electors show a better consciousness of their public duties, and are cured of that indolence or timidity by which they allow the rough and desperate to have their own way at the polls. In Italy, at all events, with a suffrage still grounded on property qualification or superior education—limited to the payers of 40 francs yearly of direct taxes, and to members of the learned professions—it not unfrequently happens that the election of a “College” or constituency mustering 1,500 registered electors, is barely attended by one-tenth of that number. With such a disposition on the part of what is considered the *élite* of the people, what other results can be expected from manhood suffrage and secret voting than what we see in France—the reign of the multitude, which is

another word for the Dictatorship of a Napoleon or a Gambetta. One might well accept the *Vox populi* as *Vox Dei*, if the mass acted on its own impulse and not often on its worst enemies' suggestion, and if zeal for its class interests did not interfere with its sense of the public good.

. By thus freely and fairly, to the best of my abilities, pointing out the shortcomings of the Italians in such experiment of an independent political life as they have up to this moment gone through, I think I have made the best case for them in what concerns the past, and set out the most encouraging prospects of what may be expected of them in the future. Twenty or even two-and-twenty years is but a short period in the existence of a nation—a brief lapse of time to efface the marks of years, to correct the stoop of the shoulders contracted by long submission to a home and foreign yoke. The Italians are not now what they were in the palmy days of ancient Rome, or what they again became in the stirring times of mediæval Florence, Genoa, or Venice. Four centuries of priestly and princely misrule could not fail to leave on their mental and moral character an impression so deep as to seem, on a cursory view, indelible; and nothing but a miracle could at once raise them to the ideal of their too sanguine well-wishers. But the question is whether any nation, under the same circumstances, would be very much better; or whether, as it used to be said before 1860, “men of any other race of duller fibre and grosser habits would, after undergoing so demoralising an ordeal, still preserve the features and upright bearing of human beings, and not crawl, like brutes, on all fours.”

The Italians, it must be allowed, have not, during this last score of years, done the best for themselves; but surely they could have done worse; and a sufficient defence for them would be the mere enumeration of the many mistakes and misdeeds which they might not unpardonably have committed, but from which they have wisely abstained. In their foreign policy, to begin with, they have not been free from vague aspirations and tender or even morbid susceptibilities—but they have, after all, always commanded their temper, soothed or quelled insane agitation, disavowed rash and absurd pretensions, put up with deliberate, galling provocation. They have not been that “sure guarantee of European peace” which would have become the mission assigned to them; they have not trusted to an inoffensive attitude as their best safeguard, and have followed their neighbours' bad example by arming themselves to the teeth. But the War Minister who called for more cannon and gunpowder had to withdraw before the prudent vote of his colleagues in the Cabinet. The charge of a military establishment has been heavy for Italy, it must be granted; but it has not, as elsewhere, led to the prevalence of militarism; it has never subjected the country to the sudden catas-

trophe of a *Pronunciamiento*. The evils of an armed peace, added to those of an overgrown and improvident Administration, have led to financial distress, and to a ruthless taxation, exhausting the resources and all but breaking the back of the nation. But even in that respect the Italians have reached the limits beyond which recklessness cannot go; they seem now bent on retrenchment; their Budget has for the last four or five years presented, if not quite a satisfactory, at least a more encouraging balance-sheet. Public confidence has risen at home and abroad, and Italian Five per Cents. are at 93 $\frac{1}{4}$.

In matters of home policy, again, it must be granted that Italy has not well withstood the influence of pseudo-democratic and ultra-humanitarian Utopias. But the Bill introducing universal suffrage and that abolishing capital punishment have not yet become law, and are hardly likely to pass without amendments that will take the sting from them—amendments, not only accepted, but even suggested by the Radical Government, always half-hearted about the measures to which it is bound by its precedents, yet which it has for these last five years managed to postpone. Italy would, moreover, not be the first country in which measures of that nature have not been repealed by the very men by whom they were most ardently and most persistently advocated.

Finally, the Italians cannot deny the charge that they have been, in politics as in crinolines, chignons, or idiot fringes, servile imitators of French fashions, aping almost exclusively the very nation which harbours perhaps the least good-will to them, and deals them the hardest snubs and slaps in the face. But they have hitherto followed their leaders at a tolerably safe distance; they have not carried French theories to their ultimate conclusions. The Italians have a ready-made "Head of the State," a corner-stone of the constitution, in their loyalty to their King and dynasty. They are not by nature hero-worshippers. Since Cavour's death and Garibaldi's marriage there has been no case of transcendent genius or miraculous valour to call forth their veneration or enthusiasm. Italy supplies Napoleons and Gambettas to her neighbours, but will have none for herself. It is fortunate also that France should show so much ingenuity, and be so ready to seize every opportunity to affront the Italians, that she should become more exacting and overbearing in proportion as she, notwithstanding her great wealth, sinks in importance and loses *prestige*. It is not many years since an Italian Deputy, on his visit to Madrid, "thanked Heaven that had created Spain, lest his own Italy should be the lowest in the scale of civilised nations." For what concerns Government, it is questionable whether either Italy or Spain herself can find anything to envy in the condition of their Gallic sister.

“THE FOUR WINDS OF THE SPIRIT.”¹

THE patron-saint of the nineteenth century is most unquestionably St. Thomas, and it may possibly be the influence of that faint-hearted apostle which makes many people welcome a new book by an old favourite with some qualms and trepidation. With authors who are at once very prolific and somewhat unequal the mixture of doubt is apt to become very considerable, and it is not uncommon to hear devotees who retain their faculty of criticism fervently wishing, when a new book by one or other of the few great writers whom Europe now boasts appears, for an arbitrary censorship with power of summarily extinguishing work unworthy of that which has gone before it. M. Victor Hugo's well-known habit of keeping his written work in a more than Horatian novitiate of seclusion before publishing it makes the danger less in his case than in some others. But it may be admitted by all but uncompromising Hugolaters that a good deal of the poetical work issued since the second *Légende* has been not altogether up to the author's high-water mark. The present volumes, however, it may be said at once and without fear, show us yet another springtide of poetry. The “Four Winds of the Spirit”—satire, drama, lyric, epic—give the author a subject of the kind certain to put him in the right vein as to general treatment. A fanciful critic seeking for picturesque analogies could find few better for Victor Hugo himself than the image of a “rushing mighty wind.” The peculiar faculty of carrying his readers off with him which he possesses, the impetuous indifference with which he attacks every subject that presents itself, the very mechanical and technical structure and sound of his verse lend themselves equally to the simile. The work by which under the four heads the poet has by turns illustrated his conception and his mastery of the four modes of poetry is very miscellaneous in kind (at least in the satiric and lyrical sections), but for the most part has a pervading unison of sentiment—that of the well-known Hugonian perfectibilism. The book seems to have been composed at dates ranging over a wide period, but very many of its parts are of that time which was perhaps the most fertile of all the fertile years of M. Victor Hugo's long life, the first decade of his exile, which saw the publication of the *Châtiments*, the *Contemplations*, and the first *Légende*. Nor will some of the poems here printed bear unfavourable comparison even with the *Chasseur Noir* and the *Aventuriers de la Mer*.

The first division of the book is on the whole by far the weakest; despite the *Châtiments*, it may be doubted whether satire is the poet's forte, unless one is prepared to concede (which I certainly do not

(1) *Les Quatre Vents de l'Esprit*. Par Victor Hugo. 2 Vols. J. Hetzel, A. Quantin. Paris: 1881.

concede) that indignation and a faculty of expression combined suffice to make a satirist. Among the defects which sane criticism must note in Victor Hugo, an insufficient sense of humour and a certain incapacity to appreciate the proportions of things must be counted, and both these are terrible drawbacks to successful satire. The satirist has no need of the vague and the vast, the special regions in which this poet's genius delights to expatiate. He must be cool, and M. Victor Hugo is never cool; dispassionate, and M. Victor Hugo is never dispassionate; able to guard himself at all points while he attacks others, and M. Victor Hugo is always laying his flanks open to the archers. He has taken d'Aubigné and Juvenal rather than Regnier and Aristophanes for his models. But it is very doubtful whether Juvenal was in such a rage as he pretends to be in, and the admirable author of *Les Tragiques* had, with all his heat, a cool logical faculty and a sevenfold shield of humorous appreciation which have hardly come down to his spiritual descendant. It is positively painful to an admirer of the greatest poet of the last half-century to find him still harping on the trumpery Brussels business, when a few dozen ragamuffins, overcome with faro and zeal, threw or did not throw a handful or so of pebbles at his windows. The piece "Muse, un nommé Ségur" is in every way inferior to the poem on the same subject in *L'Année Terrible*, of which it seems to have been a first and very properly withdrawn draft. The lines—

"Ah! ces gueux devant qui ma jeunesse eût frémi,
Pires que *Mérimée* et *Planche*, nains horribles,"

are almost shocking in their littleness, and I can only hope, without much confidence in the reasonableness of the hope, that the piece beginning "C'est bien : puisqu'au sénat," is not meant for the same address. But even in this, the only unsatisfactory part of the book (I shall not have to make a single other uncomplimentary criticism), the splendid and imperishable literary workmanship which makes Victor Hugo what he is, appears everywhere, and more than reconciles the reader. In the midst of the complaints and hallucinations of the terrible year occurs this admirable passage of self-portraiture, a passage for the most part as literally true as it is artistically beautiful :—

"Le ciel qui cache au fond des antres de Sicile
La flûte de Moschus, chère aux échos profonds,
Livre Arioste au vol fantasque des griffons,
Et fait dialoguer le prophète avec l'aigle,
Le grand ciel d'où sur nous descend l'ombre et la règle
M'avait créé pensif, de sorte que j'avais
L'œil fixé sur la route incertaine où je vais,
Et que je n'étais guère autre chose qu'un homme
Attendri, de colère et de haine économe,
Vieux par les souvenirs, jeune par les penchants,
Fait pour la vénérable allégresse des champs.
Mais en même temps j'ai, comme *Eschyle*, deux âmes,
L'une où croissent les fleurs, l'autre où couvent les flammes ;

Théocrite en mon cœur rencontre d'Aubigné ;
Ce qui fait que parfois j'ai, d'un œil indigné,
Regardé, dans ce siècle ainsi que dans l'histoire,
Cette méchanceté qu'on nomme la victoire."

Shorter passages and single lines flash out of every page, as this—

" Tacite dans la nuit pose son pied de bronze
Sur les douze dragons qu'on appelle césars ; "

a design for the statuary in itself—or as this, which Regnier would not have refused to sign :—

" En léchant le vainqueur le vaincu se console ; "

or the description of J. de Maistre, unjust enough in intention, but admirably just in form :—

" Une aigle ayant au bout de l'aile
Des ongles de chauve-souris. "

Or this, which has the right satiric mark of Dryden :—

" Cet homme espère atteindre aux grandeurs ; il s'essouffle
A passer scélérat, lui qui n'est que maroufle. "

Le Livre Satirique is the only part of the book which has to be praised by allowance. The second division, *Le Livre Dramatique*, will have in mere outward form a remarkable interest for some readers, because of the many years which have passed since M. Victor Hugo published anything dramatic, and because of the character of the piece now published. Whether I ought to say piece or pieces, I hardly know, for sub-titles and sub-divisions are numerous, the entire heading running thus, "*Le Livre Dramatique—La Femme. Les Deux Trouvailles de Gallus. I. Margarita, Comédie. II. Esca, Drame. Acte I., Lison ; Acte II., La Marquise Zabeth.*" But the whole is practically one, and might (if it can be acted at all, as to which I can say nothing, being no expert in that matter) be acted as a single piece. It is scarcely too much to say that it reveals a new facet of that wonderful gem, the literary faculty of Victor Hugo. In general conception and manner it is nearer to the exquisite dramatic work of the man whom some would have to be his rival than to anything of his own. But it is needless to say that the essence is entirely original and independent, though Gallus and Zabeth may find their class-fellows rather in *La Camargo* and her too-zealous and murderous lover than in the characters of *Hernani* and *Ruy Blas*. Gallus is Duke and Landgrave of Swabia at the end of the eighteenth century ; an unscrupulous landgrave enough, for he has deprived the rightful heir of his coronet, but not exactly a villain. At about fifty he is very tired of sovereign rule, and possessed by one of the fantastic and diabolical ideas which visit satiety. He will seek out a perfectly innocent girl, make her his mistress, and amuse himself not by depraving her, but by watching the depravity which he holds to be innate in woman as it gradually develops itself under the influence of

luxury and temptation. His henchman, Gunich, unearths a maiden in a remote and half-ruined grange, and the duke makes his approaches. But Nella, the Margarita of this wicked bird's first *trouvaille*, is doubly armed. First, she loves a handsome youth who is none other than the duke's nephew; secondly, despite her humble guise, she is a lady of birth and lineage, accustomed to traditions of magnificence, and not in the least to be dazzled by the duke's orders and uniform. The baffled seeker makes up his mind at once: he gives up the dukedom to his nephew and Nella, and sets out on his travels, still constant to his evil quest. The second piece, *Esca*, introduces us to his prey. An orphan peasant girl is betrothed to a coarse farmer, whose slovenly ways revolt her imaginative temperament, made more imaginative still by reading romances and dreaming of a possible Prince Charming. The duke arrives in the nick of time and Lisa falls. In the second act she is installed at Paris as *maitresse en titre* of the ex-duke and as Marquise Zabeth. But Gallus' familiar demon, or imp of the perverse, makes him pursue an extraordinary course of action. He is desperately afraid of falling seriously in love, and though he pays her the most delicate attentions, it is all in disguise, and he tries to make her attribute them to some of the young fops whose presence, in pursuance of his plan, he encourages round her. She, who really craves for love and not luxury, is cut to the heart by his ways and by the contemptuous words she overhears as to her own status from her servants and from the idle and overbearing youths who haunt her house. So she bids Gallus sup alone with her, and, after bitter upbraiding, poisons herself with a ring she has taken from his own finger as he slept.

"GALLUS. Ciel! mais c'est un poison! la mort terrible et prompte!"

ZABETH. Boire la mort n'est rien quand on a bu la honte.

[*Elle s'affaisse sur un fauteuil.*]

Adieu. Je prends mon vol, triste oiseau des forêts.

Personne ne m'aima. Je meurs.

[*Elle expire.*]

GALLUS. [*Se jetant à ses pieds.*] Je t'adorais!"

It is impossible in a brief argument to give any idea of the exquisite pathos and the admirable character-painting of the piece. The perverse corruption of Gallus could not be better displayed, and the scene in which he tries to put the shrewd Gunich off the scent of his feelings is, for actual dramatic excellence, equal to anything that I, at least, know in the literature of the present century. It is not easy to quote, but the central speech of this scene may do as well as anything else.

"Qu'en conclut monsieur?"

GUNICH.

Certe,

Que vous êtes, mon prince, énormément épris.

GALLUS, *se tenant les côtes.*

Ah! vraiment, mon baron est trop bête. Ah! j'en ris!

Ah! je suis amoureux parce que je m'ennuie,

Et qu'il me plaît de mettre un rayon dans la pluie,
 Du soleil dans la brume, un sourire en des yeux
 Qui, tristes, seraient laids, et qui sont beaux, joyeux.
 C'est mon goût. La beauté, plus la gaité; fleur double.
 Ah! mon pauvre espion myope, tu vois trouble.
 Ah! je suis amoureux parce que je distrais
 Mes cinquante ans à mettre en relief des attraits
 Qui, charmants sous des fleurs, sont exquis sous des perles
 Parce que le sommeil des moineaux et des merles
 Ne m'est pas à ce point sacré que dans ce bois
 Je ne me glisse avec des joueurs de hautbois,
 Et parce que j'ordonne à cinq ou six marouffes
 De faire avec leurs chants, leurs gammes et leurs souffles,
 Flotter un songe d'or sur de beaux yeux fermés!
 Parce que j'ai le goût des bouquets embaumés,
 Des bijoux envoyés aux belles, par Hercule,
 Je suis un vieux crétin d'amoureux ridicule!
 Jo m'amuse, morbleu! j'ai cette fillo-là,
 Et j'en fais le motif d'un éternel gala!
 Mais à qui donc veux-tu que je donne des roses?
 A toi? Quand tes gros yeux collent leurs cils moroses,
 Quand tu dors, dois-je aller, pendant une heure ou deux,
 Faire de la musique à tes rêves hideux?
 Faut-il qu'au point du jour sous tes volets je rôde?
 Dois-je faire couler la perle et l'émeraude
 En rivières autour de ton vieux cou ridé?
 Dois-je te déclarer sultano validé?
 Égipans, nymphes, dieux, ô faunes de Sicile,
 Accourez, venez voir cet immense imbécile!
 Mais pense un peu, voyons, peux-tu? Lise a vingt ans,
 J'en ai cinquante. Eh bien, je me masque, et j'entends,
 A défaut du bonheur, fleur que nul ne transplante,
 Lui faire une nuée amoureuse et galante.
 Personnages du conte: Angélique et Médor.
 Elle est Danaë. Soit. Moi, pluie et grêle d'or.
 Elle est Héro, pensive, et moi je me ranime
 A lui faire rêver un Léandre anonyme.
 Trouves-tu qu'être aimable est au-dessous de moi?
 Trop de distance! elle est goton et je suis roi.
 Non, béliâtre. Elle est femme, et je suis gentilhomme.
 Être amoureux! jamais. Non. Mais être économe,
 Non plus. Garder son cœur, dépenser son argent,
 C'est ma mode. Être aux goûts d'une femme indulgent,
 Lui faire tous les jours d'agréables surprises,
 Lui racheter l'ennui de voir vos mèches grises
 Par des bals, des bijoux, des fleurs; être courtois,
 Et se taire; et n'aller pas crier sur les toits:
 Mesdames et messieurs, je suis celui qui paie!
 Faire en somme à la belle une existence gaie,
 Libre, opulente, vive et jeune, de façon
 A se dire: après tout je suis un bon garçon!
 Voilà l'élégance. Hein?

GUNICH.

Vous êtes à l'escrime

Très fort."

Zabeth, though less completely drawn, is equally good, and one of her finest speeches, if room can be found for it, must be given, not

merely as the complement of the preceding, but as a masterpiece of its kind.

“ZABETH.

Pas d'amour et pas d'espoir ! je souffre.
 J'ai dans le cœur le vide et dans l'âme le gouffre.
 Monseigneur ! monseigneur ! que vous avais-je fait ?
 Ah ! l'auguste et profond soleil me réchauffait,
 Ah ! j'avais l'innocente aurore pour ivresse ;
 Ah oui, c'est vrai, d'accord, j'étais une pauvre,se,
 Et parmi les vivants, et sous le grand ciel bleu,
 Et dans tout l'univers, je n'avais rien,—que Dieu !
 Je ne l'ai plus. Abîme ! Oui, j'avais pour ressource
 De cueillir une mûre et de boire à la source,
 J'étais libre, et j'avais pour ami le rocher.
 Quelle idée eûtes-vous de venir me chercher ?
 Ce Gunich vous aida, votre digne ministre.
 Vous fîtes ce jour-là, prince, un complot sinistre
 Contre l'inconnu. Mettre un piège dans les cieux !
 Saisir une âme au vol pour lui crever les yeux !
 Ah ! ce qu'on tue au ciel, pour l'enfer on le crée.
 O monseigneur, j'étais l'ignorance sacrée.
 Qu'avez-vous fait de moi ? L'aveugle, mal conduit,
 Maudit son guide traître. Hélas ! j'étais la nuit,
 Et vous avez été la mauvaise lumière.
 Vous fîtes l'incendio, et j'étais la chaumière.
 Sans doute je penchais vers la faute, mettons
 Que j'étais coquette, oui, mais j'étais à tâtons,
 J'hésitais, un conseil honnête m'eût sauvée.
 Ah ! duc ! vous m'avez fait une affreuse arrivée
 Dans la chute par l'âcre et fausse ascension,
 Et par l'enivrement dans la perdition !
 Oui, j'étais l'alouette. Est-ce un crime ? Hélas, être,
 Moi la pauvre aile folle, et vous le miroir traître,
 Ce fut notre destin. Moi, vaine et sans effroi ;
 Vous, sans frein et frivole ! A quoi bon être roi
 Si l'on n'a dans le cœur quelque haute chimère ?
 Duc, laissant, au-dessus du vil peuple éphémère,
 Votre esprit souverain flotter dans l'absolu,
 Vous rêviez un grand rêve, altesse ; il vous a plu
 D'essayer de jeter une âme dans ce moule ;
 Devant les yeux d'un roi l'infini se déroule ;
 Créer, rien n'est plus beau ; vous avez, duc féal,
 Voulé réaliser enfin cet idéal,
 Le but noble où le cœur d'un grand prince s'applique,
 Et c'est pourquoi je suis une fille publique.
 Un, c'est le paradis, et l'enfer c'est plusieurs.
 Qu'est-ce que j'avais fait, ciel juste, à ces messieurs !
 J'ignorais ; ils savaient. Un jour, tremblante, nue,
 Je me suis vue au fond de l'opprobre, ingénue !
 Ah ! c'est un crime, c'est un sombre outrage à Dieu,
 Ah ! c'est l'assassinat d'une âme, et c'est un jeu ;
 Jusqu'à quel point c'est noir, vous l'ignorez vous-même !
 On ne sait pas toujours quel est le grain qu'on sème.
 On s'imagine avoir le droit de s'amuser,
 Et que, puisqu'on nous dore, on peut bien nous briser ;
 Vous n'êtes pas méchant pourtant, mais vous vous faites
 De nos chutes à nous, tristes femmes, des fêtes !

Ah ! la fille du peuple est prise, et le seigneur
 L'emporte, éblouissant et louche suborneur,
 Et les voilà tous deux dans la même nuée.
 Folle, et sa chevelure éparsée et dénouée,
 La malheureuse rit, et lui l'entraîne au fond
 D'une ombre où le démon avec Dieu se confond,
 Et l'on s'enivre ensemble, on s'égare, et l'on erre,
 Et de ce noir baiser sort un coup de tonnerre !
 L'atome, on peut marcher dessus. Non. Je crierai.
 Duc, vous êtes le char du triomphe doré,
 Mais savez-vous de quoi vous êtes responsable ?
 C'est de l'écrasement du pauvre grain de sable.
 Il cassera ce char dont l'orgueil est l'essieu.
 La prostitution, c'est l'hymen malgré Dieu.
 Vous n'avez vu dans moi qu'une esclave qui ploie,
 Une chair misérable, un vil spectre de joie.
 Acceptant ce vovage éternel, l'impudeur.
 Vous vous êtes trompé, monsieur. J'étais un cœur.
 Ah ! vous le croyez donc, vous avez fait ce songe
 D'être ma providence, et moi je dis : mensonge !
 Vous m'avez tout donné ? Vous m'avez tout volé !
 Vous m'avez pris l'honneur, le nom immaculé,
 Le droit aux yeux baissés, la paix dans la prière.
 Et la guie innocence, et cette extase fière
 De pouvoir confronter, quel que soit le destin,
 Sa conscience avec l'étoile du matin !
 Vous m'avez pris la joie et donné l'ironie.
 Duc, j'avais le sommeil, je vous dois l'insomnie.
 Mon père, ma mère ! oh ! j'y songe avec remords,
 Et je sens la rougeur venir au front des morts.
 Vos bienfaits, vos bontés, prince, sont des sévices ;
 Vos dons sont des soufflets. Qu'est-ce que j'ai ? Des vices.
 Par ces hideux passants mon cœur sombre est troublé."

But the whole play must be read to be appreciated.

Le Livre Lyrique is, of necessity, again fragmentary ; but, unlike the case of *Le Livre Satirique*, its fragments are almost all gold and gems. Most of them recall the tone of the *Contemplations*, but not a few are earlier echoes, going back, it would seem, to the *Feuilles d'Automne*, or even further. What to select from so rich a store is a puzzle, for whatever one rejects seems instantly to demand admission. There is a piece here, "En marchant la nuit dans un bois," in which the sombre horror of the colouring and the accompanying mystery of verbal music are matched and shaded in a way absolutely bewildering. There is a fantasy-piece of the rose sending her roots downwards to draw nourishment from the dead man's mouldering corpse, which mingles Mediæval and Renaissance sentiment in the most delightful fashion. A combined *Chanson d'autrefois* and *Chanson d'aujourd'hui* (there are two such, but the first is the best), also deserves special mention, and I find a dozen other pieces at least marked for extract or comment in my copy. But I must content myself with two pieces which give a sufficient contrast.

"Je suis fait d'ombre et de marbre.
 Comme les pieds noirs de l'arbre,

Je m'enfonce dans la nuit.
J'écoute ; je suis sous terre ;
D'en bas je dis au tonnerre :
Attends ! ne fais pas de bruit.

Moi qu'on nomme le poète,
Je suis dans la nuit muette
L'escalier mystérieux ;
Je suis l'escalier Ténèbres ;
Dans mes spirales funèbres
L'ombre ouvre ses vagues yeux.

Les flambeaux deviendront cièrges.
Respectez mes degrés vierges,
Passez, les joyeux du jour !
Mes marches ne sont pas faites
Pour les pieds ailés des fêtes,
Pour les pieds nus de l'amour.

Devant ma profondeur blême
Tout tremble, les spectres même
Ont des gouttes de sueur.
Je viens de la tombe morte ;
J'aboutis à cette porte
Par où passe une lueur.

Le banquet rit et flamboie.
Les maîtres sont dans la joie
Sur leur trône ensanglanté :
Tout les sert, tout les encense ;
Et la femme à leur puissance
Mesure sa nudité.

Laissez la clef et le pène.
Je suis l'escalier ; la peine
Médite ; l'heure viendra ;
Quelqu'un qu'entourent les ombres
Montera mes marches sombres,
Et quelqu'un les descondra.

* * * *

Un hymne harmonieux sort des feuilles du tremble ;
Les voyageurs craintifs, qui vont la nuit ensemble,
Haussent la voix dans l'ombre où l'on doit se hâter.

Laissez tout ce qui tremble

Chanter.

Les marins fatigués sommeillent sur le gouffre.
La mer bleue où Vésuvo épand ses flots de soufre
Se tait dès qu'il s'éteint, et cesse de gémir.

Laissez tout ce qui souffre

Dormir.

Quand la vie est mauvaise on la rêve meilleure.
Les yeux en pleurs au ciel se lèvent à toute heure ;
L'espoir vers Dieu se tourne et Dieu l'entend crier.

Laissez tout ce qui pleure

Prier.

C'est pour renaitre ailleurs qu'ici-bas on succombe.
Tout ce qui tourbillonne appartient à la tombe.
Il faut dans le grand tout tôt ou tard s'absorber.

Laissez tout ce qui tombe

Tomber ! "

This last piece is an admirable example of the remarkable power of composing songs, which are both songs and poems, that M. Victor Hugo possesses. The dissyllabic last line of each stanza lends itself to musical accompaniment in an extraordinary manner. But this section, though most satisfactory to those who, as it has been somewhat conceitedly put, regard "lyric as the nominative of poetry, from which all other kinds are but cases and deflections," lends itself less perhaps to comment than the others.

Le Lièvre Épique, the concluding part of the poem, will probably commend itself most of all (unless it find a rival in the drama) to those who demand a certain bulk and substance in poetical work. The epic *La Révolution*, which it contains, is, of course, an epic in miniature on the scale of the poet's own *Eviradnus*, or *Le petit roi de Galice*, rather than of an *Iliad* or a *Paradise Lost*. But its length—there must be, I should say, some thousand or twelve hundred lines—is amply sufficient to give room for the display of constructive power in the design, and the execution is equal to anything which the author has ever done. It opens with due abruptness—

"Le cavalier de bronze était debout dans l'ombre."

The bronze horseman is, of course, the famous statue of Henri Quatre, and the author, after a few lines of description, goes off into a short soliloquy on statues in general, which must be quoted.

"La statue, au regard fixe et mystérieux,
Vision du sommet et spectre de la cime,
A l'immobilité sinistre de l'abîme,
Car, étant du sépulcre, elle est de l'infini.
Ce livide cheval qui n'a jamais honni,
Ce guerrier qui, muet, semble le personnage
Du suprême silence et du grand témoignage,
Ce socle dominant les hommes, élevant
Sa paix sombre parmi leur orage vivant,
Et sortant de la tombe avec un air de gloire,
Ce colosse qui prend de force la mémoire,
Qui semble encor le roi, le tyran, le bourreau,
Et qui ne pourrait pas chasser un passereau,
Toute cette figure est un monstre du rêve;
Même quand le soleil la précise et l'achève
Et vient la regarder en face, même au jour,
Même quand les passants fourmillent à l'entour,
D'une crainte secrète elle reste vêtue,
Elle est funèbre encor ; mais le soir, la statue,
Roi pensif, dur soldat ou lugubre empereur,
Reprend toute sa nuit et toute sa terreur."

So Henri Quatre sits immovable in the darkness,

"Et la Seine fuyait avec un triste bruit
Sous ce grand chevalier du gouffre et de la nuit."

Then a voice passes—

"Va voir si ton fils est toujours à sa place."

And the statue, waking to life with a sudden quiver, descends from the pedestal and takes its way silently through the streets of sleeping Paris, till it reaches a great square with stone arcades—

"Au centre de la place, un feuillage tremblant
Laisait à demi voir un grand fantôme blanc;
C'était un cavalier de marbre.

Altier, austère,
Sur un socle, au milieu d'un perron solitaire.
Couronné de lauriers comme un César romain;
Il surgissait tranquille, auguste, surhumain.
Au socle était sculptée une main de justice.
Grave, le coude ouvert et le poing sur la cuisse,
Il tenait à la main un bâton d'empereur.
Les arbres s'effrayaient pleins d'une vague horreur,
Et leur cime semblait d'un vent d'hiver battu.

La statue alla droit dans l'ombre à la statue;
Et celui qui marchait regarda fixement
Celui qui songeait triste, immobile et dormant,
A travers la noirceur des sombres branches d'arbre.

L'homme de bronze alors dit à l'homme de marbre :

—Viens donc voir si ton fils est à sa place encor."

The marble statue obeys the bronze, and the white and black horsemen side by side continue their journey until they come to another royal image, this time again of bronze—

"Cet homme n'était pas un homme, mais un dieu.

Son front, qui semblait fait pour le ciel toujours bleu,
Se haussait arrogant, comme indigné de l'ombre;
On voyait sur sa tête un vague soleil sombre;
Il rayonnait lugubre; il avait l'air fatal
Et superbe, que donne aux morts le piédestal,
Et tout ce qu'un vainqueur répand d'horreur sacrée
Quand le roi qui détruit contient un dieu qui crée.
C'était un roi de bronze ainsi que le premier;
Il n'avait ni brassards, ni haubert, ni cimier,
Et, beau comme Apollon, était nu comme Hercule;
On voyait se courber, noirs dans le crépuscule,
Quatre fleuves, l'Escaut, l'Ister, le Doubs, le Rhin,
Sous les quatre sabots de son cheval d'airain;
Tranquille, il paraissait écouter dans les brises
Des chocs de bataillons, des cris de villes prises;
Et sa crinière était d'un lion; et, sans voix,
Sans geste, il commandait; il semblait tendre aux rois
Sa fière épée, à Dieu, dans l'azur solitaire,
Sa main, et son orteil aux baisers de la terre."

The summons is repeated here also, and Louis XIV., after a brief dialogue, joins the cavalcade in search of Louis XV. They ride silently, as before, "l'aïeul passant les fils de sa tête plus haute."

Then the poet interrupts his legend in quest of a contrast to the three sculptured kings. He finds it in "Les Cariatides," the strange sculptures of Germain Pilon, types of the people, crushed, grotesque, indignant. A long meditation on this theme follows, and then the narrative resumes. The masks burst into laughter as the monarchs pass, and one speaks—

"Et celui qui riait le plus haut dans le gouffre,
Larve ayant dans les dents une lucur de soufre,
Face mystérieuse aux cyniques sourcils
Soudain épanouie en fauve Némésis,
Jeta ce cri :

—Troupeau, tourbe, foule hagarde,
Manants, réveillez-vous ! populace, regarde ;
Ouvrez vos yeux obscurs de larmes chassieux ;
Voici trois de vos rois qui marchent sous les cieux.
Leur front a la noirceur que laisse un diadème.
Ils ont plus d'ombre en eux que n'en a la nuit même ;
Car c'est, après la mort, le sort de tous ces dieux,
Plus ténébreux, ayant été plus radieux.
Ils vont. Où donc vont-ils ? Allez ! allez ! qu'importe !
Vous n'avez pas besoin qu'on vous pousse la porte,
Rois ! la route est pavée et large est le terrain ;
Allez ! — L'un est en marbre et doux sont en airain ;
Ces rois sont faits des cœurs de tous les rois leurs pères. —
Vous tous, réveillez-vous au fond des vos repaires,
Serfs qui depuis mille ans traînez l'immense croix,
Et regardez passer ces spectres qui sont rois !
Vous en avez plouré, voici l'heure d'en rire.

Qui sont-ils ? Ecoutez ce que je vais vous dire."

Then follows a long satiric description of the three reigns, that of the reign of Louis XIV. being, as may be supposed, especially severe. But the three kings advance, and the fourth whom they seek has to be described. Readers of "La Pitié suprême" may easily imagine the description. At last the Three reach the site of the statue of the Well-beloved ; the site—for the statue has gone. In its place rise two black beams, supporting a triangular blade of livid steel ; the figures 93 are traced on the dark sky by pallid clouds, and under the accursed instrument lies a severed head.

"Et les trois cavaliers frémirent ; et, froissant
Vaguement le pommeau de sa lugubre épée,
L'aïeul de bronze dit à la tête coupée
(Dialogue funèbre et du gouffre écouté) :

— Ah ! l'expiation, dans ce lieu redouté,
Règne sans doute avec quelque ange pour ministre ?
Quel est ton crime, ô toi qui vas, tête sinistre,
Plus pâle que le Christ sur son noir crucifix ?

— Je suis le petit-fils de votre petit-fils.

— Et d'où viens-tu ?

— Du trône. O rois, l'aube est terrible !

— Spectre, quelle est là-bas cette machine horrible ?

— C'est la fin, dit la tête au regard sombre et doux.

— Et qui donc l'a construite ?

— O mes pères, c'est vous."

It is impossible to praise too highly the execution of this somewhat hasardous design. In such a thing the least false step changes the level at once to that of the ridiculous, and the reader can rarely regain the sublime. There is no false step here. The elemental accompaniments, the dark night, the turbid rushing water, the flying clouds, the rustle of the trees, present a constant framework for the central figures—a framework always changing in detail, yet always maintaining its sombre sublimity. The behaviour and language of the statues—a most dangerous ground to tread on—always harmonises, the fantastic and horrible never passes into the merely grotesque. Even in the most questionable parts, the long digression on Germain Pilon and his work, and the historical sketches of the rather loquacious mask, the measure is still kept. The reader never loses the sense of the main picture ; the sombre night and the ghostly statues still fill up the foreground, and the adjuncts are what adjuncts should be, complementary and not distracting. The author seems, despite the attractions and temptations of his grandiose and shadowy subject, to exercise a stricter control over his language than is sometimes the case with him. He has on the whole resisted the temptations into which what has been well called his proficiency in the "science des noms" sometimes leads him. The proper names are for once not in the least overdone, and shot the verse without double shooting it. On the total-impression theory, hardly any work of his, and certainly no recent work of any other living poet, comes out so well. The cavalcade of the kings fixes itself in the imagination and the memory among the durable possessions of both, and no one who has the requisite faculty of being impressed will ever read of the statue which has so frequent a place in French literature without remembering the lines already quoted—without saying to himself—

"Et la Seine fuyait avec un triste bruit
Sous ce grand chevalier du gouffre et de la nuit."

These two lines furnish, at least so it seems to me, an admirable text for any one who feels inclined to analyse the special character of Victor Hugo's poetical power and charm. I can well believe that many excellent persons, quite capable of feeling the poetical pleasure in some of its forms, may see nothing particular in them. "And the Seine fled with a sad sound under this great horseman of the gulf and the night." An expression partly commonplace and partly

bombastic ; permissible perhaps to a Frenchman whose poetry is composed in equal parts of commonplace and bombast ? Yet, again, I can believe that there are others, not quite so much out of court, who see in the matter of it a vigorous and powerful presentation of a striking image, and who accept it as such. It is well ; but it is not enough. To feel the full *ivresse de Victor Hugo*, the peculiar excitement which makes the blood (compounded of water and ink) of veteran writers run quicker, and tears rise to eyes which are bleared by the perusal of ten thousand volumes of dull prose and duller verse, the means used to produce the picture, and not merely the picture itself, must be studied till they can be instantaneously appreciated. The even and almost stealthy flow of the first line, diversified by no specially sounding syllable, and with a hardly noticeable cæsura ; the swell and crash of the second, the very contrast of form and cadence in the members of the last half of it, all enter into the total effect, and must all be appreciated if the full pleasure that the couplet can give is to be felt. I know, of course, what is commonly said against this style of criticism, that it is pedantry when it is not affectation, and affectation when it is not pedantry. So be it ; but it is at any rate a *gratissimus error*, if it be not something very different from an error at all. It certainly does not prevent us who are of its faction from enjoying the poets who seem to be (not that they are really so when they are good for anything) loss suitable for such treatment, and whom our adversaries prefer. It certainly enables us to enjoy poets whom these adversaries regard with a puzzled contempt that somehow does not seem to reach the true and indubitable luxury of genuine scientific scorn. And, as has been often contended, and must be contended again and again till it is admitted, it saves us from the inevitable drawback to which our enemies are exposed. They are at the mercy of the poet's sentiments instead of being able to enjoy whatever he gives them. Of course there are persons for whom *Les Quatre Vents de l'Esprit* will have an additional zest because the author is a republican, an anti-formalist and anti-dogmatist, if not exactly an anti-christian, a holder of wild and impracticable social theories, an egotist, a patriot almost absurdly *borné* in his patriotism. But there are other persons, and perhaps a greater number, to whom all these characteristics, or some of them, are *per se* unmitigatedly distasteful and absurd. If these unlucky people are to stay to argue with the politician, to excommunicate the heretic, to ridicule the opponent of capital punishment and the believer in the divine mission of France and Paris, they will have very little time, perhaps very little inclination, to enjoy the poet. Let us therefore begin at the other end and enjoy first—and, for the matter of that, last too. The Four Winds of the Spirit blow where they list, and the wise man uses them for his

pleasure and his profit without caring for the quarter whence or whither they blow. If these be commonplaces, as they doubtless are, they are commonplaces which a comparatively small proportion of the English reading public has mastered in reference to Victor Hugo. His matter is frequently aggressive, and too many people insist on picking up the challenge. His manner is a manner which requires from an Englishman a little trouble to master its secret, and too few people give themselves that trouble. It is almost inconceivable that any ear which has undergone the moderate amount of training necessary, should be deaf to the magnificent music of the Alexandrine as here discoursed. The measure is not more different from the English decasyllable than the English decasyllable is from the Latin hexameter, yet no Englishman of ordinary cultivation finds any difficulty in enjoying the latter. The only solid explanation of the otherwise unaccountable antipathy which the Alexandrine meets among us, is the supposition that the comparatively flat and monotonous versification of Racine, in which most Englishmen first make its acquaintance, irremediably disgusts the ear. It is needless to say that the blank verse of Shakespeare is not so different from the blank verse of Young, as is the Alexandrine of Victor Hugo from the Alexandrine of Racine. Of the Cornelian line (when the *lutin* was present) it is indeed the child. But it displays an atavism which makes it still more resemble older ancestors, the nervous strength of Regnier, the crash and burst of d'Aubigné, the majestic volume and wave-like flow of the better part of Du Bartas. There is, perhaps, no measure (other than lyrical) the intrinsic beauty, variety, and interest of which are at once more independent of the subject, and yet more ready to lend themselves to its interpretation. Nor is there any book that I know which illustrates the different capacities of the Alexandrine, narrative, descriptive, dramatic, and (with the limitations mentioned earlier) satiric, better than this. This peculiarity it owes to its definitely and deliberately miscellaneous and illustrative character. It has been well said of Victor Hugo that no poet, when he has once got a grip of his reader, has a greater power of transporting. Whether that grip is ever fixed or not, is of course very much the reader's own affair. It is sufficiently known what persons not destitute of intellect have thought of Shakespeare, and the present writer once knew an estimable man who returned a volume of Mr. Tennyson's earlier and best lyrics, sorrowfully remarking that "he could not read it, it was just like prose." A certain amount of good-will and of natural aptitude must be contributed by those who trust themselves to this Chariot of the Four Winds. But those who have made the voyage will hardly forget it, and will tread the lower earth in future with fuller and gladder memories and with loftier thoughts.

GEORGE SAINTSBURY.

COMPOUND POLITICAL HEADS.

IN the preceding chapter on chiefs and kings, we traced the development of the first element in that tri-une political structure which everywhere shows itself at the outset. We pass now to the development of the second element—the group of leading men among whom the chief is, at first, merely the most conspicuous. Under what conditions this so evolves as to subordinate the other two, what causes make it narrower, and what causes widen it until it passes into the third, we have here to observe.

If the innate feelings and aptitudes of a race have large shares in determining the sizes and cohesions of the social groups it forms, still more must they have large shares in determining the relations which arise among the members of such groups. While the mode of life followed tends to generate this or that political structure, its effects are always complicated by the effects of inherited character. Whether or not the primitive state in which governing power is equally distributed among all warriors or all elders, passes into the state in which governing power is monopolized by one, depends in part on the life of the group as predatory or peaceful and in part on the natures of its members as prompting them to oppose dictation more or less doggedly. A few facts will make this clear.

The Arafuras (Papuan Islanders) who “live in peace and brotherly love,” have no other “authority among them than the decisions of their elders.” Among the harmless Todas “all disputes and questions of right and wrong are settled either by arbitration or by a Punchayet—i.e., a council of five.” Of the Bodo and Dhimáls, described as averse to military service, and “totally free from arrogance, revenge, cruelty, and *fierté*,” we read that though each of their small communities has a nominal head who pays the tribute on its behalf, yet he is without power, and “disputes are settled among themselves by juries of elders.” In these cases, besides absence of the causes which bring about chiefly supremacy, may be noted the presence of causes which directly hinder it. The Papuans generally, typified by the Arafuras above-named, while they are described by Modera, Ross, and Kolff, as “good-natured,” “of a mild disposition,” kind and peaceful to strangers, are said by Earl to be unfit for military action: “their impatience of control . . . utterly precludes that organization which would enable the Papuans “to stand their ground against encroachments.” The Bodo and Dhimáls, while “they are void of all violence towards

their own people or towards their neighbours," also "resist injunctions, injudiciously urged, with dogged obstinacy." And of a kindred "very fascinating people," the Lepchas, amiable, peaceful, kind, as travellers unite in describing them, and who will not take service as soldiers, we are told that they will "undergo great privation rather than submit to oppression or injustice."

Where the innate tendency to resist coercion is strong, we find this uncentralized political organization maintained, notwithstanding the warlike activities which tend to initiate settled chieftainship. The Nagas "acknowledge no king among themselves, and deride the idea of such a personage among others;" their "villages are continually at feud;" "every man being his own master, his passions and inclinations are ruled by his share of brute force." And then we further find that—

"Potty disputes and disagreements about property are settled by a council of elders, the litigants voluntarily submitting to their arbitration. But correctly speaking, there is not the shadow of a constituted authority in the Naga community, and, wonderful as it may seem, this want of government does not lead to any marked degree of anarchy and confusion."

Similarly among such peoples, remote in type, as many of the warlike tribes of North America. Speaking of these Indians in general, Schoolcraft says that "they all wish to govern, and not to be governed. Every Indian thinks he has a right to do as he pleases, and that no one is better than himself; and he will fight before he will give up what he thinks right." Of the Comanches, as an example, he remarks that "the democratic principle is strongly implanted in them;" and that for governmental purposes "public councils are held at regular intervals during the year." Further, we read that in districts of ancient Central America there existed somewhat more advanced societies which, though warlike, were impelled by a kindred jealousy to provide against monopoly of power. The government was by an elective council of old men who appointed a war chief; and this war chief, "if suspected of plotting against the safety of the commonwealth, or for the purpose of securing supreme power in his own hands, was rigorously put to death by the council."

Though the specialities of character which thus lead certain kinds of men in early stages to originate compound political headships, and to resist, even under the stress of war, the rise of single political headships, are innate, we are not without clues to the circumstances which have made them innate; and with a view to interpretations presently to be made, it will be useful to glance at these. The Comanches and kindred tribes, roaming about in small bands, active and skilful horsemen, have, through long past periods, been so conditioned as to make coercion of one man by another difficult. So, too, has it

been, though in another way, with the Nagas. "They inhabit a rough and intricate mountain range;" and their villages are perched "on the crests of ridges." Again, very significant evidence is furnished by an incidental remark of Captain Burton to the effect that in Africa, as in Asia, there are three distinctly marked forms of government—military despotisms, feudal monarchies, and rude republics: the rude republics being those formed by the "Bedouin tribes, the hill people, and the jungle races." Clearly, the names of these last show that they inhabit regions which, hindering by their physical characters a centralized form of government, favour a more diffused form of government, and the less decided political subordination which is its concomitant.

These facts are obviously related to certain other facts with which they must be joined. We have seen that it is relatively easy to form a large society if the country is one within which all parts are readily accessible, while it has barriers through which exit is difficult; and that, conversely, formation of a large society is prevented, or greatly delayed, by difficulties of communication within the occupied area, and by facilities of escape from it. But, as we now see, not only is political integration under its primary aspect of increasing mass hindered by these last-named physical conditions, but there is hindrance to the development of a more integrated form of government. That which impedes social consolidation also impedes the concentration of political power.

The truth here chiefly concerning us, however, is that the continued presence of the one or the other set of conditions fosters a character to which either the centralized or the diffused kind of political organization is appropriate. Existence, generation after generation, in a region where despotic control has arisen, produces an adapted type of nature; partly by daily habit and partly by survival of those most fit for living under such control. Contrariwise, in a region favouring maintenance of their independence by small groups, there is a strengthening, through successive ages, of sentiments averse to restraint; since not only are these sentiments exercised in all by resisting the efforts from time to time made to subordinate them, but, on the average, those who most pertinaciously resist are those who, remaining unsubdued, and transmitting their characters to posterity, determine the tribal character.

Having thus glanced at the effects of the factors, external and internal, as displayed in simple tribes, we shall understand how they co-operate when, by migration or otherwise, such tribes fall into circumstances which favour the growth of large societies.

The case of an uncivilized people of the nature described, who have in recent times shown what occurs when union of small

groups into great ones is prompted, will best initiate the interpretation.

The Iroquois nations, each made up of many tribes previously hostile, had to defend themselves against European invaders. Combination for this purpose among these five (and finally six) nations, necessitated a recognition of equality of power among them; since agreement to join would not have been arrived at had it been required that some divisions should be subject to others. The groups had to co-operate on the understanding that their "rights, privileges and obligations" should be the same. Though the numbers of permanent and hereditary sachems appointed by the respective nations to form the Great Council, differed, yet the voices of the several nations were equal. (Omitting details of the organization, we have to note first, that for many generations, notwithstanding the wars which this league carried on, its constitution remained stable—no supreme individual arose; and, second, that this equality of power among the groups co-existed with inequality within each group: the people had no share in its government.

A clue is thus furnished to the genesis of those compound headships with which ancient history familiarizes us. We are enabled to see how there came to co-exist in the same societies, some institutions of a despotic kind, with other institutions of a kind appearing to be based on the principle of equality, and often confounded with free institutions. Let us recall the antecedents of those early European peoples who developed governments of this form.

During the wandering pastoral life, subordination to a single head, growing naturally out of fatherhood, was fostered. A recalcitrant member of any group had either to submit to the authority under which he had grown up, or, throwing off its yoke, had to leave the group and face those risks which unprotected life in the desert threatened. The establishment of this subordination was furthered by the more frequent survival of groups in which it was greatest; since, in the conflicts between groups, those of which the members were insubordinate, ordinarily being both smaller and less able to co-operate effectually, were the more likely to disappear. But now to the fact that in such families and clans, circumstances fostered obedience to the father and to the patriarch, has to be added the fact above emphasized, that circumstances also fostered the sentiment of liberty in the relations between clans. The exercise of power by one of them over another, was made difficult by wide scattering and by great mobility; and with successful opposition to external coercion, or evasion of it, carried on through numberless generations, the tendency to resent and resist all strange authority was likely to become strong.

Whether, when groups thus disciplined aggregate, they assume

this or that form of political organization, depends partly, as already implied, on the conditions into which they fall. Even could we omit those differences between Mongols, Semites, and Aryans, established in prehistoric times by causes unknown to us—even had complete likeness of nature been produced in them by long continuance of pastoral life; yet large societies formed by combinations of these small ones, could be similar in type only under similar circumstances. Hence, probably, the reason why Mongols and Semites, where they have settled and multiplied, have failed to maintain the autonomies of their hordes after combination of them, and to evolve the resulting institutions. Even the Aryans, among whom chiefly the less concentrated forms of political rule have arisen, yield an illustration. Originally inheriting in common the mental traits generated during their life in the Hindu Koosh and its neighbourhood, the different divisions of the race have developed different institutions and accompanying characters. Those of them who spread into the plains of India, where great fertility made possible a large population, to the control of which there were small physical impediments, lost their independence of nature, and did not evolve political systems like those which grew up among their Western kindred, under conditions favourable for maintaining the original character.

The implication is, then, that where groups of the patriarchal type fall into regions permitting considerable growth of population, but having physical structures which impede the centralization of power, compound political headships will arise, and for a time sustain themselves, through co-operation of the two factors—*independence of local groups and need for union in war.* Let us consider some examples.

The island of Crete has numerous high mountain valleys containing good pasturage, and provides many seats for strongholds—seats which ruins prove that the ancient inhabitants utilized. Similarly with the mainland of Greece. A complicated mountain system cuts off its parts from one another and renders each difficult of access. Especially is this so in the Peloponnesus; and, above all, in the part occupied by the Spartans. It has been remarked that the State which possesses both sides of Taygetus, has it in its power to be master of the peninsula: “it is the Acropolis of the Peloponnese, as that country is of the rest of Greece.”

When, over the earlier inhabitants, there came the successive waves of Hellenic conquerors, these brought with them the type of nature and organization common to the Aryans, displaying the united traits above described. Such a people taking possession of such a land, inevitably fell in course of time “into as many independent clans as the country itself was divided by its mountain chains

into valleys and districts." From separation there resulted alienation; so that those remote from one another, becoming strangers, became enemies. In early Greek times the clans, occupying mountain villages, were so liable to incursions from one another that the planting of fruit trees was a waste of labour. There existed a state like that seen at present among such Indian-hill tribes as the Nagas.

Though preserving the tradition of a common descent, and owing allegiance to the oldest male representative of the patriarch, a people spreading over a region which thus cut off from one another even adjacent small groups, and still more those remoter clusters of groups arising in course of generations, would inevitably become disunited in government: subjection to a general head would be more and more difficult to maintain, and subjection to local heads would alone continue practicable. Moreover, there must arise, under such conditions, increasing causes of insubordination, as well as great difficulties in maintaining subordination. When the various branches of a common family spread into localities so shut off from one another as to prevent intercourse, their respective histories, and the lines of descent of their respective heads, must become unknown, or but partially known, to one another; and claims to supremacy made now by this local head and now by that, are certain to be disputed. When we remember how, even in settled societies having records, there have been perpetual conflicts about rights of succession, and how, down to our own day, there are frequent law-suits to decide on heirships to titles and properties, we cannot but infer that in a state like that of the early Greeks, the difficulty of establishing the legitimacy of general headships, conspiring with the desire to assert independence and the ability to maintain it, inevitably entailed lapse into numerous local headships. Of course, under conditions varying in each locality, splittings-up of wider governments into narrower went to different extents; and naturally, too, re-establishments of wider governments or extensions of narrower ones in some cases took place. But, generally, the tendency under such conditions must have been to form small independent groups, severally having the patriarchal type of organization. Hence, then, the decay of such kingships as are implied in the *Iliad*. As Grote writes—"When we approach historical Greece, we find that (with the exception of Sparta) the primitive, hereditary, unresponsible monarch, uniting in himself all the functions of government, has ceased to reign."¹

(1) While I am writing, the just-issued third volume of Mr. Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, supplies me with an instructive illustration of the process above indicated. From his account it appears that the original Celtic tribes which formed the earldoms of Moray, Buchan, Athol, Angus, Mentsith, became broken up into clans; and how influential was the physical character of the country in producing this result, we are shown by the fact that this change took place in the parts of them which fell within the highland country. Describing the smaller groups which resulted, Mr. Skene says:—"While the clan,

But now what will happen when a cluster of clans of common descent, which have become independent and hostile, are simultaneously endangered by enemies to whom they are not at all akin, or but remotely akin? Habitually they will sink their differences and co-operate for defence. But on what terms will they co-operate? Even among friendly groups joint action would be hindered if some claimed supremacy; and among groups having outstanding feuds there could be no joint action save on a footing of equality. The common defence would, therefore, be directed by a body formed of the heads of the co-operating small societies; and if the co-operation for defence was prolonged, or became changed by success into co-operation for offence, this temporary controlling body would tend to become a permanent one holding the small societies together. The special characters of this compound head would, of course, vary with the circumstances. Where the traditions of the united clans agreed in identifying some one chief as the lineal representative of the original patriarch or hero, from whom all descended, precedence and some extra authority would be permitted to him. Where claims derived from descent were disputed, personal superiority or election would determine which member of the compound head should take the lead. If within each of the component groups the power of its chief was unqualified, there would result from union of such chiefs a close oligarchy; while the closeness of the oligarchy would become less in proportion as recognition of the authority of each chief, given by nearness in blood to the divine or semi-divine ancestor, diminished. And in cases where there came to be incorporated numerous aliens, owing allegiance to the heads of none of the component groups, there would come into play influences tending still more to widen the oligarchy.

Such, we may conclude, were the origins of those compound headships of the Greek states which existed at the beginning of the historic period. In Crete, where there survived the tradition of primitive kingship, but where dispersion and subdivision of clans had brought about a condition in which "different towns carried on open feuds," there were "patrician houses, deriving their rights from the early ages of royal government," who continued "to retain possession of the administration." In Corinth the line of Herakleid

viewed as a single community, thus consisted of the chief, with his kinsmen to a certain limited degree of relationship; the commonalty who were of the same blood, who all bore the same name, and his dependants, consisting of subordinate septs of native men, who did not claim to be of the blood of the chief, but were either probably descended from the more ancient occupiers of the soil, or were broken men from other clans, who had taken protection with him. . . . Those kinsmen of the chief who acquired the property of their land founded families. . . . The most influential of these was that of the oldest cadet in the family which had been longest separated from the main stem, and usually presented the appearance of a rival house little less powerful than that of the chief."

kings "subside gradually, through a series of empty names, into the oligarchy denominated Bacchiadæ. . . . The persons so named were all accounted descendants of Hēraklēs, and formed the governing caste in the city." So was it with Megara. According to tradition, this arose by combination of several villages inhabited by kindred tribes, which, originally in antagonism with Corinth, had, probably in the course of this antagonism, become consolidated into an independent state. And at the opening of the historic period the like had happened in Sikyon and other places. Though in Sparta kingship had survived under an anomalous form, yet the joint representatives of the primitive king, still revered because the tradition of their divine descent was preserved, had become little more than members of the governing oligarchy, retaining certain prerogatives. And though it is true that in its earliest historically-known stage, the Spartan oligarchy did not present the form which would spontaneously arise from the union of the heads of clans for co-operation in war—though it had become elective within a limited class of persons; yet the fact that an age of not less than sixty was a qualification, harmonizes with the belief that it at first consisted of the heads of the respective groups, who were always the eldest sons of the eldest; and that these groups with their heads, described as having been in pre-Lykurgean times "the most lawless of all the Greeks," became united by that continuous militant life which distinguished them.¹

(1) As bearing on historical interpretations at large, and especially on interpretations to be made in this work, let me point out further reasons than those given by Grote and others for rejecting the tradition that the Spartan constitution was the work of Lykurgus. The universal tendency to ascribe an effect to the most conspicuous proximate cause, is especially strong where the effect is one of which the causation is involved. Our own time has furnished an illustration in the ascription of Corn-law Repeal to Sir Robert Peel, and after him to Messrs. Cobden and Bright: leaving Colonel Thompson unnamed. In the next generation the man who for a time carried on the fight single-handed, and forged sundry of the weapons used by the victors, will be unheard of in connexion with it. It is not enough, however, to suspect that Lykurgus was simply the finisher of other men's work. We may reasonably suspect that the work was that of no man, but simply that of the needs and the conditions. This may be seen in the institution of the public mess. If we ask what will happen with a small people who, for generations spreading as conquerors, have a contempt for all industry, and who, when not at war, pass their time in exercises fitting them for war, it becomes manifest that at first the daily assembling to carry on these exercises will entail the daily bringing of provisions by each. As happens in those pic-nics in which all who join contribute to the common repast, a certain obligation respecting qualities and quantities will naturally arise—an obligation which, repeated daily, will pass from custom into law: ending in a specification of the kinds and amounts of food. Further, it is to be expected that as the law thus arises in an age when food is coarse and unvaried, the simplicity of the diet, originally unavoidable, will eventually be considered as intended—as an ascetic regimen deliberately devised. [When writing this I was not aware that, as pointed out by Prof. Paley in *Fraser's Magazine*, for February, 1881; that among the Greeks of later times, it was common to have dinners to which each guest brought his share of provisions, and that those who contributed little and consumed much were objects of satire. This fact greatly increases the probability that the Spartan mess originated as suggested.]

The Romans exemplify the rise of a compound headship under conditions which, though partially different from those the Greeks were subject to, were allied fundamentally. In its earliest-known state, Latium was occupied by village-communities, which were united into cantons, while these cantons formed a league headed by Alba—a canton regarded as the oldest and most eminent. This combination was for joint defence; as is shown by the fact that each group of clan-villages composing a canton, had an elevated stronghold in common, and also by the fact that the league of cantons had for its centre and place of refuge, Alba, the most strongly placed as well as the oldest. The component cantons of the league were so far independent that there were wars between them; whence we may infer that when they co-operated for joint defence it was on substantially equal terms. Thus before Rome existed, the people who formed it had been habituated to a kind of life such that, with great subordination in each family and clan, and partial subordination within each canton (which was governed by a prince, council of elders, and assembly of warriors), there went a union of heads of cantons, who were in no degree subordinate one to another. When the inhabitants of three of these cantons, the Ramnians, Titians, and Luceres, began to occupy the tract on which Rome stands, they brought with them their political organization. The oldest Roman patricians bore the names of rural clans belonging to these cantons. Whether, when seating themselves on the Palatine hills and on the Quirinal, they preserved their cantonal divisions, is not clear; though it seems probable *a priori*. But, however this may be, there is proof that they fortified themselves against one another, as well as against outer enemies. The "mount-men" of the Palatine and the "hill-men" of the Quirinal were habitually at feud; and even among the minor divisions of those who occupied the Palatine, there were dissensions. As Mommsen says, primitive Rome was "rather an aggregate of urban settlements than a single city." And that the clans who formed these settlements brought with them their enmities, is to be inferred from the fact that not only did they fortify the hills on which they fixed themselves, but even "the houses of the old and powerful families were constructed somewhat after the manner of fortresses."

So that again, in the case of Rome, we see a cluster of small independent communities allied in blood but partially antagonistic, which had to co-operate against enemies on such terms as all would agree to. In early Greece the means of defence were, as Grote remarks, greater than the means of attack; and it was the same in early Rome. Hence, while coercive rule within each family and small group was easy, there was difficulty in extending coercion over many groups: fortified as they were against one another. Moreover, the stringency

of government within each settlement constituting the primitive city, was diminished by facility of escape from one and admission into another. As we have seen among simple tribes, desertions take place when the rule is unduly harsh; and we may infer that, within each of these clustered settlements, there was a check on exercise of force by the heads of the more powerful families over those of the less powerful, caused by the fear that migration might weaken the settlement and strengthen an adjacent one. Thus the circumstances were such that when, for defence of the primitive city, co-operation became needful, the heads of the clans included in the several settlements came to have substantially equal powers. The original senate was the collective body of clan-elders; and "this assembly of elders was the ultimate holder of the ruling power:" it was "an assembly of kings." At the same time, the heads of families in each clan, forming the body of burgesses, stood, for like reasons, on equal footing. Primarily for command in war, there was an elected head, who was also chief magistrate. Though not having the authority given by alleged divine descent, he had the authority given by supposed divine approval; and, himself bearing the insignia of a god, he retained till death the absoluteness appropriate to one. But besides the fact that the choice, originally made by the senate, had to be again practically made by it in case of sudden vacancy; and besides the fact that each king, nominated by his predecessor, had to be approved by the assembled burgesses; there is the fact that his power was exclusively executive. The assembly of burgesses "was in law superior to, rather than co-ordinate with, the king." Further, in the last resort was exercised the still superior power of the senate; which was the guardian of the law and could veto the joint decision of king and burgesses. Thus the constitution was in essence an oligarchy of heads of clans, included in an oligarchy of heads of houses—a compound oligarchy which became unqualified when kingship was suppressed. And here should be emphasized the truth, sufficiently obvious and yet continually ignored, that the Roman Republic which remained when the regal power ended, was quite alien in nature to those popular governments with which it has been commonly classed. The heads of clans, of which the narrower governing body was formed, as well as the heads of families which formed the wider governing body, were, indeed, jealous of one another's powers; and in so far simulated the citizens of a free state who individually maintain their equal rights. But these heads severally exercised unlimited powers over the members of their households and over their clusters of dependants. A community of which the component groups severally retained their internal autonomies, with the result that the rule within each remained absolute, was nothing but an aggregate of small despotisms... Institutions under which

the head of each group, besides owning slaves, had such supremacy that his wife and children, including even married sons, had no more legal rights than cattle, and were at his mercy in life and limb, or could be sold into slavery, can be called free institutions only by those who confound similarity of external outline with similarity of internal structure.¹

The formation of compound political heads in later times repeats the process in essentials if not in details. In one way or other, this result arises when a common need for defence compels co-operation, while there exists no means of securing co-operation save voluntary agreement.

Beginning with the example of Venice, we notice first that the region occupied by the ancient Veneti included the extensive marshy tract formed of the deposits brought down by several rivers to the Adriatic—a tract which, in Strabo's day, was "intersected in every quarter by rivers, streams, and morasses;" so that "Aquileia and Ravenna were then cities in the marshes." Having for their stronghold this region full of spots accessible only to inhabitants who knew the intricate ways to them, the Veneti maintained their independence, spite of the efforts of the Romans to subdue them, until the days of Cæsar. In later days, kindred results were more markedly displayed in that part of this region specially characterized by inaccessibility. From the earliest times the islets, or rather mud-banks, on which Venice stands, were inhabited by a maritime people. Each islet, secure in the midst of its tortuous lagunes, had a popular government of annually elected tribunes. And these original governments, existing at the time when there came several thousands of fugitives, driven from the mainland by the invading Huns, survived under the form of a rude confederation. As we have seen happens in other cases, the union into which these independent little communities were forced for purposes of joint defence, was disturbed by feuds; and it was only under the stress of opposition to aggressing Lombards on the one side and Sclavonic pirates on the other, that a general assembly of nobles, clergy, and citizens appointed a duke or doge to direct the combined forces and to restrain internal factions: being superior to the tribunes of the united islets and subject only to this body which appointed him. What changes subsequently took place—how, beyond the restraints imposed by the general assembly, the doge was presently put under the check

(1) I should have thought it needless to insist on so obvious a truth had it not been that even still there continues this identification of things so utterly different. Within these few years has been published a magazine-article by an historian, describing the corruptions of the Roman Republic during its latter days, with the appended moral that such were, and are, likely to be the results of democratic government.

of two elected councillors, and on important occasions had to summon the principal citizens; how there came afterwards a representative council, which underwent from time to time changes—does not now concern us. Here we have simply to note that, as in preceding cases, the component groups being favourably circumstanced for severally maintaining their independence of one another, the imperative need for union against enemies initiated a rude compound headship, which, notwithstanding the centralizing effects of war, tended to maintain itself in one or other form.

On finding allied results among men of a different race but occupying a similar region, doubts respecting the process of causation must be dissipated. On the area—half land, half sea—formed of the sediment brought down by the Rhine and adjacent rivers, there early existed scattered families. Living on isolated sand-hills, or in huts raised on piles, they were so secure amid their creeks and mud-banks and marshes, that they remained unsubdued by the Romans. Subsisting at first by fishing, with here and there such small agriculture as was possible, and eventually becoming maritime and commercial, these people, in course of time, rendered their land more habitable by damming out the sea; and they long enjoyed a partial if not complete independence. In the third century, “the low countries contained the only free people of the German race.” Especially the Frisians, more remote than the rest from invaders, “associated themselves with the tribes settled on the limits of the German Ocean, and formed with them a connexion celebrated under the title of the ‘Saxon League.’” Though, at a later time, the inhabitants of the low countries fell under the power of France; yet the nature of their *habitat* continued to give them such advantages in resisting foreign control, that they organized themselves after their own fashion notwithstanding interdicts. “From the time of Charlemagne, the people of the ancient Menapia, now become a prosperous commonwealth, formed political associations to raise a barrier against the despotic violence of the Franks.” Meanwhile the Frisians, who, after centuries of resistance to the Franks, were obliged to yield and render small tributary services, retained their internal autonomy. They formed “a confederation of rude but self-governed maritime provinces:” each of these seven provinces being divided into districts severally governed by elective heads with their councils, and the whole being under a general elective head and a general council.

Of illustrations which modern times have furnished, must be named those which again show us the effects of a mountainous region. The most notable is, of course, that of Switzerland. Surrounded by forests, “among marshes, and rocks, and glaciers, tribes of scattered shepherds had, from the early times of the Roman conquest, found a land of refuge from the successive invaders of the

rest of Helvetia." In the labyrinths of the Alps, accessible to those only who knew the ways to them, their cattle fed unseen ; and against straggling bands of marauders who might discover their retreats, they had great facilities for defence. These districts—which eventually became the cantons of Schweitz, Uri, and Unterwalden, originally having but one common centre of meeting, but eventually, as population increased, getting three, and forming separate political organizations—long preserved complete independence. With the spread of feudal subordination throughout Europe, they became nominally subject to the Emperor ; but, refusing obedience to the superiors set over them, they entered into a solemn alliance, renewed from time to time, to resist outer enemies. Details of their history need not detain us. The fact of moment is that in these three cantons, which physically favoured in so great a degree the maintenance of independence by individuals and by groups, the people, while framing for themselves free governments, united on equal terms for joint defence. And it was these typical "Swiss," as they were the first to be called, whose union formed the nucleus of the larger unions which, through varied fortunes, eventually grew up. Severally independent as were the cantons composing these larger unions, there at first existed feuds among them, which were suspended during the needs for joint defence. Only gradually did the leagues pass from temporary and unsettled forms to a permanent and settled form. Two facts of significance should be added. One is that, at a later date, a like process of resistance, federation, and emancipation from feudal tyranny, among separate communities occupying small mountain valleys, took place in the Grisons and in the Valais : regions which, though mountainous, were more accessible than those of the Oberland and its vicinity. The other is that the more level cantons neither so early nor so completely gained their independence ; and, further, that their internal constitutions were less free in form. A marked contrast existed between the aristocratic republics of Berne, Lucerne, Fribourg, and Soleure, and the pure democracies of the forest cantons and the Grisons : in the last of which "every little hamlet resting in an Alpine valley, or perched on mountain crag, was an independent community, of which all the members were absolutely equal—entitled to vote in every assembly, and qualified for every public function." "Each hamlet had its own laws, jurisdiction, and privileges:" the hamlets being federated into communes, the communes into districts, and the districts into a league.

Lastly, with the case of Switzerland may be associated that of San Marino—a little republic which, seated in the Apennines, and having its centre on a cliff a thousand feet high, has retained its independence for fifteen centuries. Here 8,000 people are

governed by a senate of 60 and by captains elected every half-year : assemblies of the whole people being called on important occasions. There is a standing army of 18 ; "taxation is reduced to a mere nothing ;" and officials are paid by the honour of serving.

One noteworthy difference between the compound heads arising under physical conditions of the kinds exemplified, must not be overlooked—the difference between the oligarchic form and the more or less popular form. As shown at the outset of this section, if each of the groups united by militant co-operation is despotically ruled—if the groups are severally framed on the patriarchal type, or are severally governed by men of supposed divine descent ; then the compound head becomes one in which the people at large have no share. But if, as in these modern cases, patriarchal authority has decayed ; or if belief in divine descent has been undermined by a creed at variance with it ; or if peaceful habits have weakened that coercive authority which war ever strengthens ; then the compound head is no longer an assembly of petty despots. With the progress of these changes it becomes more and more a head formed of those who exercise power not by right of position but by right of appointment.

There are other conditions which favour the rise of compound heads, temporary if not permanent : those, namely, which occur at the dissolutions of preceding organizations. Among people habituated through countless generations to personal rule, having sentiments appropriate to it, and no conception of anything else, the fall of one despot is at once followed by the rise of another ; or, if a large personally-governed empire collapses, its parts severally generate governments for themselves of like kind. But among less servile peoples, the breaking up of political systems having single heads, is apt to be followed by the establishment of others having compound heads ; especially where there is a simultaneous separation into parts which have not local governments of stable kinds. Under such circumstances there is a return to the primitive state. The pre-existing regulative system having fallen, the members of the community are left without any controlling power save the aggregate will ; and political organization having to commence afresh, the form first assumed is akin to that which we see in the assembly of the savage horde, or in the modern public meeting. Whence there presently results the rule of a select few subject to the approval of the many.

In illustration may first be taken the rise of the Italian republics. When, during the ninth and tenth centuries, the German Emperors, who had long been losing their power to restrain local antagonisms in Italy and the outrages of wandering robber bands, failed

more than ever to protect their subject communities, and, as a simultaneous result, exercised diminished control over them; it became at once necessary and practicable for the Italian towns to develop political organizations of their own. Though in these towns there were remnants of the old Roman organization, this had obviously become effete; for, in time of danger, there was an assembling of "citizens at the sound of a great bell, to concert together the means for their common defence." Doubtless on such occasions were marked out the rudiments of those republican constitutions which afterwards arose. Though it is alleged that the German Emperors allowed the towns to form these constitutions, yet we may reasonably conclude, rather, that having no care further than to get their tribute, they made no efforts to prevent the towns from forming them. And though Sismondi says of the townspeople "*ils cherchèrent à se constituer sur le modèle de la république romaine*," yet we may question whether, in those dark days, the people knew enough of Roman institutions to be influenced by their knowledge. With more probability may we infer that "this meeting of all the men of the state capable of bearing arms . . . in the great square," originally called to take measures for repelling aggressors—a meeting which must, at the very beginning, have been swayed by a group of dominant citizens and must have chosen leaders, was itself the republican government in its incipient form. Meetings of this kind, first occurring on occasions of emergency, would gradually come into use for deciding on all important public questions. Repetition would bring greater regularity in the modes of procedure, and greater definiteness in the divisions formed; ending in compound political heads, presided over by elected chiefs. And that this was the case in those early stages of which there remain but vague accounts, is shown by the fact that a similar, though somewhat more definite, process afterwards occurred at Florence, when the usurping nobles were overthrown. Definite records tell us that in 1250 "the citizens assembled at the same moment in the square of Santa Croce; they divided themselves into fifty groups, of which each group chose a captain, and thus formed companies of militia: a council of these officers was the first-born authority of this newly revived republic." Clearly that sovereignty of the people which, for a time, characterized these small governments, would inevitably arise if the political form grew out of the original public meeting; while it would be unlikely to have arisen had the political form been artificially devised by a limited class.

That this interpretation harmonizes with the facts which modern times have furnished, scarcely needs pointing out. On an immensely larger scale and in ways variously modified, here by the slow collapse of an old *régime* and there by combination for war, the rise of

the first French Republic and of the American Republic have similarly shown us this tendency towards resumption of the primitive form of political organization, when a decayed or otherwise incapable government is broken up. Greatly obscured by complicating circumstances and special incidents as these transformations were, we may recognize in them the play of the same general causes.

In the last chapter we saw that, as conditions determine, the first element of the tri-une political structure may be differentiated from the second in various degrees: beginning with the warrior-chief slightly predominant over other warriors, and ending with the divine and absolute king, widely distinguished from the select few next to him. By the foregoing examples we are shown that the second element is, as conditions determine, variously differentiated from the third: being at the one extreme qualitatively distinguished in a high degree and divided from it by an impassable barrier, and at the other extreme almost merged into it.

Here we are introduced to the truth next to be dealt with; that not only do conditions determine the various forms which compound heads assume, but that conditions determine the various changes they undergo. There are two leading kinds of such changes—those through which the compound head passes towards a less popular form, and those through which it passes towards a more popular form. We will glance at them in this order.

Progressive narrowing of the compound head is one of the concomitants of continued military activity. Beginning with the case of Sparta, the constitution of which in its early form differed but little from that which the *Iliad* shows us existed among the Homeric Greeks, we see, in the first place, the tendency towards concentration of power in the regulation, made a century after Lykurgus, that "in case the people decided crookedly, the senate with the kings should reverse their decisions;" and then we see that later, in consequence of the gravitation of property into fewer hands, "the number of qualified citizens went on continually diminishing:" the implication being not only a relatively-increased power of the oligarchy, but, probably, a growing supremacy of the wealthier members within the oligarchy itself. Turning to the case of Rome, ever militant, we find that in course of time inequalities increased to the extent that the senate became "an order of lords, filling up its ranks by hereditary succession, and exercising collegiate misrule;" and then "out of the evil of oligarchy there emerged the still worse evil of usurpation of power by particular families." In the Italian Republics, again, perpetually at war one with another, there resulted a kindred narrowing of the governing body. The nobility, deserting their castles, began to direct "the municipal

government of the cities, which consequently, during this period of the Republics, fell chiefly into the hands of the superior families." Then at a later stage, when industrial progress had generated wealthy commercial classes, these, competing with the nobles for power, and finally displacing them, repeated within their respective bodies this same process. The richer guilds deprived the poorer of their shares in the choice of the ruling agencies; the privileged class was continually narrowed by disqualifying regulations; and newly risen families were excluded by those of long standing. So that, as Sismondi points out, such of the numerous Italian Republics as remained nominally such at the close of the fifteenth century, were, like "Sienna and Lucca, each governed by a single caste of citizens: . . . had no longer popular governments." A kindred result occurred among the Dutch. During the wars of the Flemish cities with the nobles and with one another, the relatively popular governments of the towns became narrowed. The greater guilds excluded the lesser from the ruling body, and their members "clothed in the municipal purple . . . ruled with the power of an aristocracy . . . the local government was often an oligarchy, while the spirit of the burghers was peculiarly democratic." And with these illustrations may be joined that furnished by those Swiss cantons which, physically characterized in ways less favourable to individual independence, were at the same time given to wars, offensive as well as defensive. Berne, Lucerne, Fribourg, Soleure, acquired political constitutions in large measure oligarchic; and in "Berne, where the nobles had always been in the ascendant, the entire administration had fallen into the hands of a few families, with whom it had become hereditary."

We have next to note as a cause of progressive modification in compound heads, that, like simple heads, they are apt to be subordinated by their administrative agents. The first case to be named is one in which this effect is exemplified along with the last—the case of Sparta. Originally appointed by the kings to perform prescribed duties, the ephors first made the kings subordinate, and eventually subordinated the senate; so that they became substantially the rulers. From this we may pass to the instance supplied by Venice, where power, once exercised by the people, gradually lapsed into the hands of an executive body, the members of which, habitually re-elected, and at death replaced by their children, became an aristocracy, whence there eventually grew the council of ten, who were, like the Spartan ephors, "charged to guard the security of the state with a power higher than the law;" and who thus, "restrained by no rule," constituted the actual government. Through its many revolutions and changes of constitution, Florence exhibited like tendencies. The appointed administrators, now signoria, now priors, became able, during their

terms of office, to carry out their ends even to the extent of suspending the constitution: getting the forced assent of the assembled people, who were surrounded by armed men. And then, eventually, the head executive agent, nominally re-elected from time to time but practically permanent, became, in the person of Cosmo di' Medici, the founder of an inherited headship.

But the liability of the compound political head to become subject to its civil agents, is far less than its liability to become subject to its military agents. From the earliest times this liability has been exemplified and commented upon; and, familiar as it is, I must here illustrate and emphasize it, because it directly bears on one of the cardinal truths of political theory. Setting out with the Greeks we observe, in the first place, that the tyrants, by whom oligarchies were so often overthrown, had armed forces at their disposal. Either the tyrant was "the executive magistrate, upon whom the oligarchy themselves had devolved important administrative powers;" or he was a demagogue, who pleaded the alleged interests of the community, "in order to surround" himself "with armed defenders:" soldiers being in either case the agents of his usurpation. And then, in the second place, we see the like done by the successful general. As Macchiavelli remarks of the Romans—

"For the further abroad they [the generals] carried their arms, the more necessary such prolongations [of their commissions] appeared, and the more common they became; hence it arose, in the first place, that but a few of their Citizens could be employed in the command of armies, and consequently few were capable of acquiring any considerable degree of experience or reputation; and in the next, that when a Commander in chief was continued for a long time in that post, he had an opportunity of corrupting his army to such a degree that the Soldiers entirely threw off their obedience to the Senate, and acknowledged no authority but his. To this it was owing that Sylla and Marius found means to debauch their armies and make them fight against their country; and that Julius Cæsar was enabled to make himself absolute in Rome."

The Italian Republics, again, furnish many illustrations. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, those of Lombardy "all submitted themselves to the military power of some nobles to whom they had intrusted the command of their militias, and thus all lost their liberty." Later times and nearer regions yield instances. At home Cromwell showed how the successful general tends to become autocrat. In the Netherlands the same thing was exemplified by the Van Arteveldes, father and son, and again by Maurice of Nassau; and but for form's sake it would be needless to name the case of Napoleon. It should be added that not only by command of armed forces is the military chief enabled to seize on supreme power; but acquired popularity, especially in a militant nation, places him in a position which makes it relatively easy to do this. Neither their own experience, nor the experiences of other nations throughout the

past, prevented the French from lately making Marshal Macmahon executive head ; and even the Americans, in more than once choosing General Grant for president, proved that, predominantly industrial though their society is, militant activity promptly caused an incipient change towards the militant type, of which an essential trait is the union of civil headship with military headship.

From the influences which tend to narrow compound political headships, or change them into single ones, let us pass to the influences which tend to widen them. The case of Athens is, of course, the first to be considered. To understand this we must remember that up to the time of Solon, democratic government did not exist in Greece. The only known forms were the oligarchic and the despotic; and in those early days, before political speculation began, it is certain that there was not recognized in theory, a social form wholly unknown in practice. We have, therefore, to exclude the notion that popular government arose in Athens under the guidance of any preconceived idea. As having the same implication should be added the fact that—Athens being governed by an oligarchy at the time—the Solonian legislation served but to qualify and broaden the oligarchy and remove crying injustices. In seeking the causes which worked through Solon, and also made practicable the re-organization he initiated, we shall find them to lie in the direct and indirect influences of trade. Grote comments on “the anxiety, both of Solon and of Draco, to enforce among their fellow-citizens industrious and self-maintaining habits :” a proof that, even before Solon’s time, there was in Attica little or no reprobation of “sedentary industry, which in most other parts of Greece was regarded as comparatively dishonourable.” Moreover, Solon was himself in early life a trader ; and his legislation “provided for traders and artisans a new home at Athens, giving the first encouragement to that numerous town-population, both in the city and in the Peiræus, which we find actually residing there in the succeeding century.” The immigrants who flocked into Attica because of its greater security, Solon was anxious to turn rather to manufacturing industry than to cultivation of a soil naturally poor ; and one result was “a departure from the primitive temper of Atticism, which tended both to cantonal residence and rural occupation ;” while another result was to increase the number of people who stood outside those gentile and phratric divisions, which were concomitants of the patriarchal type and of personal rule. And then the constitutional changes made by Solon were in leading respects towards industrial organization. The introduction of a property-qualification for classes, instead of a birth-qualification, diminished the rigidity of the political form ; since acquirement of wealth by industry, or otherwise, made possible an admission into the oligarchy, or among others of the privileged. By forbidding self-

enslavement of the debtor, and by emancipating those who had been self-enslaved, his laws added largely to the enfranchised class as distinguished from the slave-class. In another aspect this change, leaving equitable contracts untouched, prevented those inequitable contracts under which, by a lien on himself, a man gave more than an equivalent for the sum he borrowed. And with a decreasing number of cases in which there existed the relation of master and slave, went an increasing number of cases in which benefits were exchanged by agreement. The odium attaching to that lending at interest which ended in slavery of the debtor, having disappeared, legitimate lending became general and unopposed; the rate of interest was free; and accumulated capital was made available. Then, as co-operating cause, and as ever-increasing consequence, came the growth of a population favourably circumstanced for acting in concert. Urban people who, daily in contact, can gather one another's ideas and feelings, and who by quickly-diffused intelligence can be rapidly assembled, can co-operate far more readily than those who are scattered through rural districts. With all which direct and indirect results of industrial development, must be joined the ultimate result upon character, produced by daily fulfilling and enforcing contracts—a discipline which, while requiring each man to recognize the claims of others, also requires him to maintain his own. In Solon himself this attitude which joins assertion of personal rights with respect for the rights of others, was well exemplified; since, when his influence was great he refused to become a despot, though pressed to do so, and in his latter days he resisted at the risk of death the establishment of a despotism. In various ways, then, increasing industrial activity tended to widen the original oligarchic form, and initiate a more popular form. And though these effects of industrialism, joined with subsequently-accumulated effects, were for a long time held in check by the usurping Peisistratidæ, yet, being ready to show themselves when, some time after the expulsion of these tyrants, there came the Kleisthenian revolution, they were doubtless instrumental in then initiating the popular form of government.

Though not in so great a degree, yet in some degree, the same causes operated in liberalizing and widening the Roman oligarchy. Rome "was indebted for the commencement of its importance to international commerce;" and, as Mommsen points out, "the distinction between Rome and the mass of the other Latin towns must certainly be traced back to its commercial position, and to the type of character produced by that position. . . . Rome was the emporium of the Latin districts." Moreover, as in Athens, though doubtless to a smaller extent, trade brought an increasing settlement of strangers, to whom rights were given, and who, joined with emancipated slaves

and with clients, less bound to their patrons, formed an industrial population, the eventual inclusion of which in the burgh-body caused that widening of the constitution effected by Servius Tullius.

The Italian republics of later days again show us, in numerous cases, this connexion between trading activities and a freer form of rule. The Italian towns were industrial centres.

“The merchants of Genoa, Pisa, Florence, and Venice supplied Europe with the products of the Mediterranean and of the East: the bankers of Lombardy instructed the world in the mysteries of finance, and foreign exchanges: Italian artificers taught the workmen of other countries the highest skill in the manufactures of steel, iron, bronzo, silk, glass, porcelain, and jewelry. Italian shops, with their dazzling array of luxuries, excited the admiration and envy of foreigners from less favoured lands.”

Then, on looking into their histories, we find that industrial guilds were the bases of their political organizations; that the upper mercantile classes became the rulers, in some cases excluding the nobles; and that while external wars and internal feuds tended continually to revive narrower, or more personal, forms of rule, rebellions of the industrial citizens from time to time occurring, tended to re-establish popular rule.

When we join with these the like general connexions that arose in the Netherlands and in the Hanse towns—when we remember the liberalization of our own political institutions which has gone along with growing industrialism—when we observe that the towns more than the country, and the great industrial centres more than the small ones, have given the impulses to these changes; it becomes unquestionable that while by increase of militant activities compound headships are narrowed, they are widened in proportion as industrial activities become predominant.

In common with the results reached in preceding chapters, the results above reached show that types of political organization are not matters of deliberate choice. It is common to speak of a society as though it had, once upon a time, decided on the form of government which thereafter existed in it. Even Mr. Grote, in his comparison between the institutions of ancient Greece and those of mediæval Europe (vol. iii. pp. 10—12) tacitly implies that conceptions of the advantages or disadvantages of this or that arrangement, furnished motives for establishing or maintaining it. But, as gathered together in the foregoing sections, the facts show us that as with the genesis of simple political headships, so with the genesis of compound political headships, conditions and not intentions determine.

Recognizing the fact that independence of character is a factor, but ascribing this independence of character to the continued exist-

ence of a race in a *habitat* which facilitates evasion of control, we saw that with such a nature so conditioned, co-operation in war causes the union on equal terms of groups whose heads are joined to form a directive council. And according as the component groups are governed more or less autocratically, the directive council is more or less oligarchic. We have seen that in localities differing so widely as do mountain regions, marshes or mud islands, and jungles, men of different races have developed political heads of this compound kind. And on observing that the localities, otherwise so unlike, are alike as being severally made up of parts difficult of access, we cannot question that to this is mainly due the governmental form under which their inhabitants unite.

Besides the compound headships which are thus indigenous in places favouring them, there are other compound headships which arise after the break-up of preceding political organizations. Especially apt are they so to arise where the people, not scattered through a wide district but concentrated in a town, can assemble bodily. Control of every kind having disappeared, it happens in such cases that the aggregate will has free play, and there establishes itself for a time that relatively popular form with which all government begins; but, regularly or irregularly, a superior few become differentiated from the many, and of predominant men some one is made, directly or indirectly, most predominant.

Compound headships habitually become, in course of time, either narrower or wider. They are narrowed by militancy, which tends over to concentrate directive power in fewer hands, and, if continued, almost certainly changes them into simple headships. Conversely, they are widened by industrialism. This, by gathering together aliens detached from the restraints imposed by patriarchal, feudal, or other such organizations; by increasing the number of those to be coerced in comparison with the number of those who have to coerce them; by placing this larger number in conditions favouring concerted action; by substituting for daily enforced obedience, the daily fulfilment of voluntary obligations and daily maintenance of claims; tends ever towards equalization of citizenship.

HERBERT SPENCER.

DENMARK.

DENMARK is, alike in extent and in population, one of the smallest independent countries of Europe. Since the loss of the Slesvig-Holstein Duchies it comprises an area of 15,218 square miles, and has nearly two millions of inhabitants, being thus considerably inferior in population to Switzerland, although almost equal in area. It is essentially an insular kingdom, its only continental territory being the peninsula of Jutland, between which and the great Scandinavian peninsula lies the archipelago of the Danish Islands, separated from the mainland and from each other by arms of the sea, for the most part narrow and shallow. The Færö Isles are included in Denmark Proper, while Iceland, Greenland, and several islands (St. Thomas, Ste. Croix, and St. John) in the West Indies, complete the Danish monarchy. Lying thus between the Baltic and the German Ocean, or, in Danish phrase, between the "Eastern and Western Seas," and intersected everywhere with fiords, bolts, and sounds, Denmark is a country where it is not easy to get away from the vicinity of salt water—if, indeed, the tideless waters of the Baltic can be truly described as "salt." There are no mountains and no lofty hills in Denmark, the highest elevation being 550 feet above the sea-level; most of the rivers are mere brooks, and the grander features of nature are lacking.

It is a smiling country of corn-field and meadow, of lake and forest, with tall groves of beech fringing its shores, and reflecting bright, autumnal tints in the calm waters of bay and fiord. *Det hedder Gamle Danmark, og det er Freia's Sal.* (This is named Old Denmark, and this is Freia's Hall.) The love and pride with which every true Dane regards *Det Lille Land* cannot fail to excite strong sympathies in British hearts, and we may justly entertain towards this cradle of our race such feelings as are expressed by a living American poet towards his "Little Mother Isle":—

"Hugged in the clinging billow's clasp
From seaweed fringe to upland heather,
The British oak with rooted grasp
Her slender handful holds together;—
With cliffs of white and bowers of green,
And ocean narrowing to caress her,
And hills and threaded streams between,—
Our little mother land, God bless her!"

For "British oak" read "Danish beech," and these words of Mr. Oliver Wendell Holmes give a perfect description of Denmark. Even the splendid exaggeration with which he speaks of "Britain's

noble dead " is not inappropriate to a country whence came the ancestors of many who have made the name of Britain famous:—

"Beneath each swinging forest bough
 Some arm as stout in death reposes,—
 From wave-washed foot to heaven-kissed brow
 Her valour's life-blood runs in roses;
 Nay, let our brethren of the West
 Write smiling in their florid pages,
 One half her soil has walked the rest
 In poets, heroes, martyrs, sages."

The Danish nation is small as to numbers, but it has been prolific of distinguished men, particularly of authors, and Danish literature, in verse and in prose, may claim to rank with the literature of languages spoken by the leading races of modern times.

The history of the political relations between England and Denmark is a tale of mutual injuries; but "blood is thicker than water," and sympathy still exists, notwithstanding all that has come and gone, between two kindred nations, inhabiting the same latitudes, and living under similar free institutions. In ancient days England covered before the Viking invaders, while "yet her cicatrice looked raw and red after the Danish sword." In modern times a British fleet attacked and destroyed that of Denmark without any provocation, and the city of Copenhagen was cruelly bombarded a few years later by an overwhelming British force. But in 1864 a far more fatal injury was inflicted by England upon Denmark, when two first-class military Powers were arrayed against that gallant little kingdom, and an utterly hopeless struggle was undertaken in the belief that deeds would follow words on the part of British statesmen, and that Denmark would not be left to "stand alone." An Englishman can only hang his head in silence when he is asked by a Dane, "Why did you not tell us that you never intended to give us armed assistance? Your expressions of sympathy may have been well meant, but they deceived us and brought us to destruction." To the misplaced confidence of the Danes in British aid the loss of the Duchy of Slesvig is largely due, but even if a certain bitterness on that account is still felt among them, it does not affect their kindly welcome of a visitor from England.

There is no country, beyond the limits of the British Empire, where an Englishman with good introductions finds himself more completely at home than in Denmark. The people resemble in character and feature those whom he has left on the other side of the "herring-pond," the landscape is homelike in its smiling cultivation and waving woods, where rise the towers and pinnacles of stately country mansions, the absence of which is conspicuous in

many parts of the European continent. These mansions usually are built in the handsome style known as that of Christian IV., of red brick and grey stone, with steep slated roofs and iron pinnacles, and are surrounded with moats. They are inhabited by an aristocracy, resembling indeed the landowners of this country in the love of rural pursuits, but characterized by a social exclusiveness and a political liberalism alike foreign to the ideas of the ordinary British squire. A Danish nobleman of high position may almost be condemned to celibacy, if there should chance to be no marriageable daughter in any of the few families with whom he may contract a perfectly equal alliance. He is precluded by social etiquette from giving or receiving hospitality upon equal terms with any mere "bourgeois," however wealthy and however estimable, and the richest merchant in Copenhagen will accept this position of social inferiority without any apparent feeling of humiliation. The same nobleman, who cannot ask his banker to dinner without loss of dignity, may receive a visit at his country seat from the King himself, and will hardly regard it as an act of condescension on the part of his sovereign. When the late King Frederick VII. married a plebeian wife, he was literally "cut" by the Danish nobility, who declined to attend his court, and avoided speaking to him upon all occasions. His offer of a hunting visit on the usual friendly terms to a leading grandee was met with the reply, that the castle and estates were entirely at his Majesty's service, but that the count regretted his own inability to be present, or to have the honour of receiving the King. This pride of caste is not incompatible with enlightened and advanced political views. Speaking of a great territorial magnate, who has taken an active and distinguished part in Danish politics, his nephew, a gentleman thoroughly familiar with English public life, remarked to me: "You ask whether my uncle is not a Conservative, being opposed, as he is, to the majority of the Folkething, and a supporter of the present Government by the minority. I can only reply that *here* we call him a Conservative, but he would hardly pass for a Tory in England, where his opinions would rather be regarded as those of an advanced Liberal." The estates of this nobleman are so extensive that he has actually rebuilt or is rebuilding no less than thirty-six parish churches on his own land. All the buildings on his property are maintained in as good order as the churches, and the same may be said of the extensive woods and numerous private roads. A Danish landed proprietor, living on his estates, and only visiting Copenhagen for a few months during the winter, occupied with his home farm, his plantations, and field sports, is indeed far from attaining the type of the ancient Hellene and of the British aristocrat, so dear to the heart of Mr. Phœbus. However much he may live in the open air, he can find

time to open a book, and seems to regard a gentleman who speaks no language but his own as an unfortunate individual, who has been denied the education due to his position. In Danish society French is the favourite among foreign languages, but English is very generally understood and spoken, as also is German, although distinctly less popular. Danish officers, naval and military, are expected to be familiar with all three languages, and can hardly understand how we manage to dispense with any such knowledge in the British service. A gentleman who had accompanied the Crown Prince of Denmark when he visited Russia on the occasion of his sister's marriage to the Czarewitch, remarked to me with astonishment that only one of all the English officers whom he there chanced to meet could converse in any language except English. He added: "I suppose that this was quite exceptional;" I could only say that I *hoped* it was so.

Large and handsome farmsteadings are frequent in Denmark, and in the case of old-fashioned country houses the entrance to the moated mansion lies through the great courtyard of the home farm. Here in one huge cow-byre as many as two hundred cows are sometimes collected, and the manufacture of butter and cheese is conducted upon a colossal scale. Neither in Scotland nor in Holland can finer arable and dairy farms be seen than in various parts of Denmark, the island of Laaland in particular being characterized by its fertility and careful cultivation. At frequent intervals in a Danish landscape the village churches display their quaint belfries, with gable roofs and crow-steps, and close to each church is nestled a snug little *Prestegaard* (parsonage), the abode of a cultivated Lutheran priest, usually a family man, resembling in his position the country clergyman of England, or still more of Scotland. There is a general cessation from work on Sunday, although the day is not observed with anything like gloomy rigour, and attendance at church is also general, at least in country districts.

The sensible and practical manner in which Danish laymen can deal with a religious difficulty has been recently illustrated in the *Folkething* (House of Commons), when a newly-elected deputy, Mr. Brandes, declared (like Mr. Bradlaugh) that a religious oath was to him a meaningless form of words. He added that he did not object to utter the prescribed words, and that he was ready to undertake all the obligations and duties of a deputy. He was accordingly permitted to recite the usual oath in the usual form, the interpretation being left to his own conscience.

In this matter, as in a good many others, it is probable that "England will think to-morrow what Denmark thinks to-day." In carrying out the domestic reforms of which the United Kingdom stands so greatly in need, and to which of late years so little atten-

tion has been paid, certain valuable hints might be taken by British statesmen from the legislators and administrators of Denmark, which seems at present to have as little that is rotten in its state as any country of Europe.

The history of agrarian reform in Denmark is of the highest interest to those who seek to reform the land system existing in Great Britain, and at the present crisis of the Irish land question that history is full alike of instruction and of encouragement. By peaceful constitutional methods, mainly within the experience of the present generation, as complete a change in the Danish land system has been carried out as that which was effected in France by the Revolution of 1789. This change has been attended with the happiest results, as the carefully-compiled report of Mr. G. Strachey upon "Land Tenure in Denmark" (dated Copenhagen, 18th December, 1869), conclusively proves. Mr. Strachey tells us that during the last forty years the leasehold farms of Denmark have been converted into the freeholds of substantial yeomen, holding sixty or seventy acres of good land, or a larger extent where the land is poor. Three-quarters of the cultivated area of Denmark were held in 1869 by 70,000 yeomen-farmers, nearly all freeholders, while one-eighth of the remainder was held in smaller lots, averaging five acres, by 137,000 peasants, two-thirds of them freeholders. These yeomen and peasants have a majority in the Folkething, or popular Chamber, in which many of them sit, and the consciousness of their altered and independent position has exercised a salutary moral and social influence over the rural population in Denmark.

The term *Bonde* may be translated "yeoman," or "farmer," and implies an owner or occupier of land not exceeding 120 acres and not less than ten, whatever may be his social rank, while the owner or occupier of a smaller lot is known as *Husmand*, literally "house-man," a *crofter* or peasant. Of the former class Mr. Strachey tells us that the *Bonde* is an advanced politician, respectable, and upright; he is prudent in domestic affairs, postponing marriage until he is able to support a family, and he frequently leaves his land to a daughter. To an efficient system of compulsory education the prosperity and independence of the Danish agriculturist are no doubt largely due.

Even the tenants under life-leases, now comparatively few in number, have grown too strong for the landlords, to whom the right of selling by auction a vacant life-lease is of little or no value, as usage compels them to let the farm to a child or representative, if any exist, of the last occupier. In fact, as Mr. Strachey says, "the Danish landlord is not, except as regards his demesne, the complete legal or customary master of his own, and Danish legal practice grants tenant-farmers something like concurrent ownership in the

ground." Not much more than one-eighth of the cultivated land in Denmark is held as demesne land by large proprietors; in 1869 there were 1,750 manorial estates, averaging about 370 acres in extent, and upon these estates only does the Danish law recognise any such absolute rights of individual ownership as are claimed by the landlords of the United Kingdom over the soil *a centro ad cælum*.

Denmark and Ireland present a singular contrast in the modern developments of the land system, which was in early times very similar in the two countries. The Irish Land Commission of 1880 reports that "farms have remained in the same families, have descended from father to son, and are considered to be fully as much the family property of the tenant as the reversion of them is part of the family property of the landlord." Exactly the same language might be used with truth in speaking of the old tenemental farms in Denmark, and in recent times the Danish Legislature has consistently laboured to extinguish the reversionary right of the landlord, and to convert the tenant into a freeholder by purchase.

The British Parliament has followed a different course: it has ignored the tenant-right, which Irish public opinion and tradition have always recognised; it has presupposed an absolute and unrestricted right of property in the Irish landlord; and it has acknowledged no interest in the soil on the part of the tenant, except such as he may derive from his contract with the all-powerful landlord. Even in 1860 an Act of Parliament asserts that the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland is "founded on the express or implied contract of the parties;" and in 1870, for the first time in British legislation, it was admitted, in a somewhat grudging spirit, that the occupier has certain rights and claims beyond what may be derived from the mere good pleasure of the landlord. "An Irish tenant's privileges under the present law" are briefly stated in a paper just issued by the Irish Land Committee, and, doubtless, to a committee of Irish landlords they appear substantial enough. To a Danish *Bonde* the receipt of "a sum of money, varying from one to seven years of his rent," would seem a mockery of compensation "for disturbance in his holding by the act of his landlord," in other words, for the confiscation by his landlord of all his occupancy rights through an arbitrary "notice to quit."

A very valuable work on the Danish land laws has been published recently (Copenhagen, 1880) by L. C. Borup, Assessor of the High Court; it is entitled *Den Danske Landboret*, and gives a clear statement not only of the existing law as to landed property in Denmark, but also of the important changes which have been effected in the tenure of land at various times during the past century. It is not necessary to trace the history of village communities, which obtained in Denmark as in other Aryan countries. To come to a nearer date,

by the law of 1781 it is provided that any shareholder in a village community, however small his individual share may be, can insist upon withdrawing from the community, and upon having his fair allotment of land made over to him in one, two, or at most three parcels. The remaining shareholders, even if they themselves desire to maintain the fellowship, must bear their share in the expenses incurred through carrying out the partition and assignment of the land. An agreement undertaken against dissolving a land fellowship is not legally binding, and it is illegal to establish any new fellowship in land. So much for the sanctity of private contract in Denmark, when the welfare of the public appears to be affected.

Beneficial as was the effect of abolishing community of ownership in arable land, Danish agriculture continued to suffer depression, because of the unfortunate manner in which the feudal tenure of land had developed itself. The farm lands generally were not the freehold property of the cultivators, who were subjected in various ways to the arbitrary will of a landlord, and were obliged to render their payment for the use of the land mainly in labour bestowed upon the cultivation of the landlord's manorial demesne. They were, therefore, not in possession of such control over the soil, and over their own time, as enabled them to arrange their farming operations upon a suitable plan, and they lacked security that they would ever enjoy the benefit of their own labour and outlay.

The service due to the lord of the manor, known as *Hoveri* (soccage or villeinage), was usually demanded just at those seasons of seedtime and harvest when the peasant was busied with the cultivation of his own farm. Besides community of ownership and the manorial requisitions of labour and vehicles, there existed other serious impediments to agriculture, such as tithes, or tiends, and oppressive game laws, so that Danish land reformers during the past century have had a laborious task to perform. They have certainly not been idle, and each of these abuses has been successively dealt with, until a satisfactory change has been effected in the land tenure and the agricultural prosperity of Denmark. So vigorous have been their legislative efforts, especially since 1849, that forced labour has been abolished, tithes have been commuted, game laws have been reformed, and comparatively few farms remain that are not the freehold property of their occupiers.

Assessor Borup states that the Danish legislature long ago recognised this truth: "Alike upon social and upon economical grounds it is most disadvantageous that the bulk of the soil should be cultivated by others than those who own it." Upon this principle the modern land legislation of Denmark has been founded. Lands belonging to the State, or to public institutions and corporations, were dealt with in the first place, and no difficulty was experienced

in transferring them to peasant proprietors. They were offered for purchase to the occupiers at reasonable prices, but if the occupiers did not choose to buy, they were disposed of by public auction as soon as the term of occupancy expired. Even in this case, however, certain advantages were reserved for a purchaser who was a relation or a representative of the deceased occupier. The above provisions were contained in laws passed between 1851 and 1865, which effected the alienation of lands belonging to the State, to Copenhagen University and City, to Sorø Academy, and to other ecclesiastical and corporate associations. As regards farms belonging to private owners, the difficulties in the way of transferring them from the landlords to the occupiers were considerably greater, the principal impediment being the entails or trusts, which affected many estates, and strictly prohibited the alienation of any *Bøndergods* (farm-lands) thereto appertaining. In 1854, however, legal authority was conferred upon the possessors of existing *Lehne og Stamhuse* (entailed fiefs and manors) to alienate farms in favour of the occupiers; and by a law passed in 1866 the creation of new entails is forbidden. By removing all legal impediments, and by affording to landlords substantial inducements to convert their tenants into freeholders, the great agrarian reform, which has given the land of Denmark to the people of Denmark, has been gradually and peacefully accomplished. The "villein" is now a free landowner, and has fairly purchased both his land and his liberty.

Landed property in Denmark consists of "free earth," and "unfree earth." "Free earth" includes *Hovedgaardsjord* (manorial land), and *Præstegaardsjord* (glebe land); it was originally the land occupied by the noble class, and enjoyed various privileges and exemptions, now nearly all abolished.

"Unfree earth" is *Bondejord* (peasant land), occupied by farmers or cultivators, who until modern times were rarely the owners. *Bondejord* has always been subjected to various legal restrictions, many of which still remain in force, especially as regards *Gaarde* or *farms* properly so-called; these restrictions, applicable originally to leasehold or copyhold farms, having been maintained with certain modifications under the modern freehold tenure.

Danish farmers or peasants belong to two classes: *Selveiere*, who are proprietors of the land they cultivate, and *Fæstere*, who are tenants for life, holding under a tenure peculiar to Denmark, viz. a lease for two lives, those of the occupier and his widow. These *Fæstere* may be compared to copyholders under an English lord of the manor; they were liable formerly to personal labour and other vexatious burdens, now commuted into money payments.

To reduce the number of mere tenants, while increasing that of proprietors, has been admittedly an object aimed at by Danish

legislation ; but it has also been maintained as a guiding principle, that the land cultivated by the peasantry shall not be suffered to change its condition by passing into fewer hands.

Hence all true *farms*, even those which belong to peasant proprietors, are subjected to certain restrictions, and an owner is not entitled, except under special conditions, either to amalgamate several farms into a single holding, or to divide a single farm into several holdings. Several annual penalties may be inflicted by law upon any owner who, without the special sanction of the Minister of the Interior, either absorbs and suppresses a farm-steading, or neglects to provide it with occupiers within a certain period of its becoming vacant. If an owner of two farms inhabits one of them, he will almost invariably be permitted to cultivate the other for his own behoof, but never more than two altogether ; and by a law passed in 1872 the power of an owner to suppress a separate farm-steading, even with the assent of the Ministry, has been limited to particular cases.

A *Bondegaard* (farmyard) is supposed to consist of a certain extent of arable land, and the owner is not entitled to take away from it so much land that it will cease to be a true *Gaard*.

These limitations upon the discretion of private owners are intended to preserve and maintain each *Bondegaard* as a separate homestead, to be cultivated by resident farmers or peasants working on their own account, not by mere bailiffs or caretakers. Under the old manorial system, now generally superseded by *Selveiendom* (freehold tenure), the number of homesteads was maintained by the *Fæstetvang* (compulsion to lease), binding the landlord to lease any vacant farm above a certain size to a new tenant, for the tenant's life and that of his widow. *Fæstetvang* affects all remaining copyhold farms, and under certain conditions such freehold estates as consist of "unfree earth." Upon high authority the maxim is laid down, that this legal custom does not exist merely in order to protect the tenant against extortion on the part of the landlord, but is intended also to afford a secure position upon the land, and a genuine interest in its well-being, to as many families as possible. "If one man should get two farms, then there must be one more man who cannot get one farm." Where *Fæstetvang* does not exist, there may be *Forpagtningstrang*, a milder form of obligation, not implying the necessity of granting a lease for two lives, or for fifty years, but permitting shorter periods. *Fæsteiendom* is equivalent to copyhold property ; it implies "unfree" land forming part of a manorial estate, not merely a farm leased and occupied by a person who is not the proprietor. It must always be held and cultivated apart from the "free" manorial land ; and, if it be a farm exceeding a certain extent of arable land, it must be let upon a lease for two lives, or fifty years. Smaller holdings may be let upon short leases,

but neglect or delay in letting the land involves heavy annual penalties, and it is the duty of an *Amtmand* (sheriff) to report to the Ministry of the Interior any such neglect or delay occurring within his own district. If no tenant for a farm can be found under such conditions of lease as the landlord proposes, and if the local *Amtmand* sees no objection to the proposed conditions, then for three years the landlord may deal with the farm as he pleases. Ultimately the Minister of the Interior may be called upon to decide as to the terms upon which the farm shall be offered for occupancy, but at present this point has no practical importance, the force of custom and public opinion causing reasonable terms to be offered by landlords, and tenants being easily obtained. Recent legislation, in order to encourage the enfranchisement of *Fæsteiendom* (copyhold), permits a lord of the manor to add to his "free" manorial estate as much "unfree" land as is equal to one-ninth of the enfranchised copyhold land, but this may be done only when the land has been enfranchised in favour of the actual occupier, or one of his immediate representatives. In such cases a preference is given to the representative selected by the copyholder himself, or by his widow; failing both of them the landlord may choose from any one of the four classes of privileged representatives: children, children-in-law, step-children, and foster-children.

Upon a change of occupancy in *Fæsteiendom*, the lord of the manor is entitled to receive a fine payable by the incoming tenant, and known as *Indfæstning*. The payment beforehand of a considerable sum has a tendency to cripple the tenant on taking up his new farm, and as the duration of his lease is quite uncertain, depending upon his life, and that of his widow if he is married, this is a somewhat speculative investment of capital. For this evil a remedy was provided by legislation in 1861, and in the case of all farms, let in *Livsfæste* (life-lease or copyhold) since that date, a certain proportion of the *Indfæstning* is repayable, when the lease, owing to the death of tenants, has not lasted for thirty years; compensation is also given for unexhausted improvements. The special conditions under which the life-tenant holds are set forth in the *Fæstebrev* (contract), which fixes the amount of his yearly rent for the whole term of his occupancy, and usually stipulates that he shall pay all rates and taxes. Unless specially authorised by the terms of his contract the *Fæster* (life-tenant) may not sub-let the farm, nor cut down trees, nor sell peat, but he has a presumptive right to kill game.

By a law passed in 1872 the landlord has a preferential claim against the life-tenant's goods for all arrears of rent, and he has the right of eviction upon various grounds, involving misconduct on the part of the life-tenant, who is bound to keep farm-steading and

fences in good repair, and not to injure the farm through mischievous treatment of the soil. Eviction for non-payment of rent is legal, but hardly ever takes place in Denmark. Although the landlord cannot evict without some act of misconduct on the part of the life-tenant, the latter may at any time renounce his lease, if he can assign for so doing grounds which appear to be generally reasonable. The widow may renounce her life-lease at her discretion, and it is at once annulled if she marries again. Even an *Arvefæster* (hereditary leaseholder), unless specially prohibited by the terms of his *Fæstebrev*, can renounce the lease, so as to bind his heirs by the renunciation.

Houses, under which term are included small crofts and patches of land not amounting to farms, may be let by contract for any short period, or upon mere notice to quit. In the absence of any contract, however, the presumption of law is that the house or land in question has been let for the life of the tenant and his widow, if the occupation has lasted undisturbed for more than six months. When the buildings upon a copyhold farm are actually the property of the tenant, and the landlord declines to take them at a valuation, they may be removed at the end of the lease.

The amount of land in Denmark held under the copyhold tenure diminishes steadily and rapidly; in 1835 there were 29,795 copyhold farms, in 1850 there were 20,305, and in 1868 only 9,216. That is to say, during a single generation more than two-thirds of the copyhold farms in Denmark have been enfranchised. These farms, however, although enfranchised from the manors, and thereby largely increased in value, are not "free earth" in the same sense as the manors themselves, but remain as tenemental lands, subject to the restrictions of the *Fæstetvang*. *Demesnes* and *glebes*, on the other hand, are absolutely free, and may be leased to any one, for any time, and upon any conditions. *Demesne* or manorial farms are usually of a much larger area than the ordinary tenemental farms, but they are comparatively few in number, and do not include as much as one-seventh of the arable lands of Denmark. Except in the case of "free earth" a certain joint ownership, at least as to the surface of the soil, is legally recognised in the occupier of every Danish farm, whether the proprietor be squire or peasant; and the effect of giving legal force to this idea of joint ownership has been to merge the owner in the occupier throughout the greater part of Denmark.

Entailed estates still exist in Denmark, but they are comparatively few in number, and since the constitutional amendments of 1849 no new entailed estates can be founded. *Stamhus* is a manorial property, placed under the fetters of a strict trust for the maintenance of a certain family; as a rule, the founder must have been

noble, and the estate must be a manor of not less than 400 *Tönder Hartkorn*. *Lehn* resembles *Stamhus*, but is a royal fief, and lapses to the State upon a failure of succession. There are still upwards of thirty *Lehne* in Denmark, some baronies and some counties, the former being estates amounting to 1,000, and the latter to 2,500 *Tönder Hartkorn*.¹

In order to preserve these great estates undiminished, and to maintain the dignity of certain noble families, the actual possessors are placed under such restrictive bonds as oblige them to leave an intact inheritance to their next heirs of entail. The heir in possession of an entailed estate cannot sell any portion thereof for his own personal advantage, except when he enfranchises copyhold land in favour of the actual copyholder or his acknowledged representatives; in such a case he is entitled to receive a percentage on the money payable for the enfranchisement, the bulk of it being placed in trust for the benefit of the entailed estate. He cannot mortgage the revenues of the estate except for the period of his own possession, nor can he bind his successor by any obligation unless it may have been incurred for the distinct advantage of the estate.

During his usufruct the revenues of the entailed estate are liable for his debts, but the estate itself is in no way liable. He may grant leases upon *customary* conditions, so as to bind his successor; but if he acts to the manifest injury of the estate, his next heir may apply to have him placed under administration. Danish entails usually follow the rules of primogeniture by cognate relationship, brothers ranking before sisters; and when the family favoured by the entail becomes extinct, the estate lapses to the last heir as a freehold.

The numerous privileges formerly attaching to the possession of a *Sædegaard*, in the way of jurisdictions and exemptions, have been swept away by the great constitutional reforms of 1849, one alone surviving, viz. exemption from tithes. In order to provide portions for children to whom no land is bequeathed, considerable burdens are laid upon the land in Denmark, and it is said to be mortgaged up to 40 per cent. of its total value. The owners of small crofts have less extensive testamentary rights than persons whose land amounts to an actual *farm*, the class of holding always favoured by Danish law.

So completely are all classes upon a footing of political equality now in Denmark, and so fully is personal liberty enjoyed by all, that it is difficult to realise the fact that prædial serfdom has been extinguished only within our own times. Perhaps to this cause may be attributed the pronounced radicalism in politics which characterizes the rural population of Denmark, just as the confirmed liberalism of the Scotch constituencies may be said to have resulted

(1) The amount of land-tax payable, not the area, is here stated.

from their having been deprived of political rights down to so late a period of history.

When a life-tenant dies, leaving a son¹ desirous of succeeding him in the farm, it is not by law required that the proprietor should accept the son as the new tenant, but custom, almost as strong as a law, renders it impossible to refuse without some special reason. Rack-renting is practically unknown, and even when a Danish landlord has made all permanent improvements upon a farm at his own expense, he does not seek to exact the highest competitive rent, but is contented with a fair valuation, thereby leaving a considerable margin of profit to the farmer, who is in consequence prosperous and well to do. On the other hand, it is customary for a tenant to give security for the year's rent, and in many cases he makes improvements conjointly with the landlord. The large manorial farms, many of which are in the hands of the owners themselves, are admittedly cultivated in a superior manner to the farms of the smaller yeomen, but even on the best farms the rent is low, considering the general facilities of transport by land and water; twenty-five shillings an acre is a high rent for good land.

Danish law readily places limitations upon the power of private landowners to gratify their own caprice or cupidity, and to disregard the rights and interests of the nation at large. As early as A.D. 1733 the right of proprietors to cut timber was restricted, and the destruction of forests, even by the owners, was made a punishable offence. Down to the beginning of this century the greater portion of the forest land in Denmark was held under various forms of common property. Either the land, with all that grew upon it, was owned by several persons in common; or certain persons owned the forest, subject to rights of pasture enjoyed by others; or, again, one set of persons might own the tall timber, another set the undergrowth, and a third the grass. Such divided ownership was quite incompatible with the proper management of forest land, and in A.D. 1805 a law was passed to provide for sharing the land and protecting the timber throughout all tracts of actual forest then in existence. These tracts are now known as *Fredskov* (literally "peace forest"), and the restrictions in question refer to them only, the owner having discretionary rights over more recent plantations. The law of 1805 even gave special power to proprietors to withdraw copyhold land from cultivation and to abolish farms, in order to enclose and plant the land with forest trees. Tracts so enclosed and planted must be treated as *Fredskov*, and must be maintained perpetually as forest land. In 1872 there was fresh legislation upon the subject of *Fredskov*, which is placed under the special pro-

(1) The term *son* here may be said to include son-in-law, step-son, foster-son, with their descendants, also the corresponding female relations.

tection of the Minister of the Interior and of forest inspectors appointed by him. Any landlord who converts Fredskov into fields or meadows by clearing away the timber, is liable to an annual fine of 8 *Rigsdaler* (18 shillings) for each *Tönde* ($1\frac{1}{2}$ acre) of forest so destroyed, until he can satisfy the Minister of the Interior that he has enclosed and planted the same or an equal area; and he is liable subsequently to half the above-named fine until the young wood has grown sufficiently to be safe from injury by animals, even if unenclosed. These privileged tracts of forest must not be cut in such a manner that young wood cannot be reared as natural seedlings from trees left standing. An owner transgressing this rule is liable to be fined, and should he persist in his mismanagement, the forest may be taken in hand, at his risk, by the Government. Preserved forest must be properly fenced, no hay mowing must take place under the trees, and no domestic animals, except swine, are allowed to pasture therein. A purchaser of preserved forest, during the first ten years of his ownership, may cut timber for his own ordinary use, but not for sale, unless the trees to be cut for sale are marked by the official forester of the Government. These regulations have preserved the beautiful woods which are so pleasing a feature in Danish scenery, and which seemed at one time to be threatened with gradual destruction. Ancient monuments are also under the protection of the public, and in certain parts of the country every little knoll is crowned with a *Kæmpehøje* (giant's grave). Perhaps these monuments are even too well protected, being so numerous in some places as to interfere with cultivation nearly as much as the graves which are so thickly sprinkled over the plains of China.

The satisfactory working of the Danish land laws is doubtless largely due to the mode in which all titles to and encumbrances upon land are recorded in the public register. So perfect and so simple is the system that all necessary information as to a property about to change hands can be at once ascertained, and the process of conveyance and registration only costs between 1 and 3 per cent. on the purchase money.

Denmark is a country where one-half of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits, and the welfare of the cultivator has long been an object of solicitude to those in power. The Danish peasant, originally a free man, lost his liberty by degrees under the feudal system, and fell into a condition of practical serfdom. From this condition he has been gradually raised once more into that of a free landowner by a series of wise agrarian reforms, which have at the same time greatly enhanced the value of the land itself. A century ago tenants for farms could not be found without great difficulty, the Danish peasant being then, like his French brother, "taillable et corvéable à merci et à miséricorde;" but in his case

legislation, instead of revolution, provided the remedy. As early as A.D. 1769 we find embodied in a Danish law the declaration that the best spur to agricultural industry and progress is the feeling that a man is bestowing his labour on his own land.

If Denmark were a mere dependency of a powerful and prosperous neighbouring nation whose ruling classes believed in the advantages of accumulating vast estates in a few hands, and invariably legislated with the view of bringing about such a result, then it is probable that Denmark would be at this moment a country of great landlords and pauper peasants, as it was a century ago. Supported by the military force of the dominant nation the Danish aristocracy could have resisted either constitutional reform or armed insurrection, and the Danish peasantry would now be in a condition resembling that of the peasantry in Ireland. Happily the Danes have been able to make their own laws, and to carry into effect, by constitutional methods, those principles of land tenure which seemed good to them. The privileged classes, knowing their inability to resist by force, accepted their change of condition with a wonderfully good grace, and the establishment of a landed democracy in Denmark took place, without shock or convulsion, through gradual and spontaneous enfranchisement of the land. Mr. Strachey, an independent English witness, who tells us that his opinions were formed *after* the facts had been collected, not *before*, and that many of them are the reverse of those at which he would have thought himself likely to arrive, thus describes the results of this great agrarian reform: "The Danish *Jorddrot* (landlord) was till recent times the scourge of the peasantry. Under his parental love the Danish *Bonde* (farmer) was a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water; his lot was no better than that of the most miserable ryot of Bengal. The *Bonde* is now the freest, the most politically wise, the best educated of European yeomen."

Oehlenschläger, the chief of Danish poets, has depicted the spectre of a feudal lord, who revisits for the last time the scene of his former greatness, and wanders gloomily through the moon-lit ruins of his castle. The night passes away, the sun smiles forth, and he beholds a sight more galling to his pride than the crumbling condition of his lofty tower. The peasant, no longer a thrall, hastens cheerfully to labour in his own fields, and the burgher stands upright and fearless, "wearing his hat," even in the august presence of the *Ridder* (knight or noble). The angry spirit vanishes, and is seen no more upon earth. The gloomy shade of feudalism has indeed passed away for ever from Denmark, and the sun of freedom shines upon a prosperous and contented people, firmly rooted in the soil of their native land.

DAVID WEDDERBURN.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN SAXONY.

IN 1867 I had occasion to visit some of the more important textile manufactories of Mulhouse. Shortly after my return I met one of our most intelligent and successful Manchester calico printers. I told him that at Mulhouse the junior partner of the principal print works, those of Messieurs Dollfus, was a highly educated chemist, who had passed through the full course of instruction of one of the great German polytechnic schools. My Manchester friend replied, "Oh! we can buy our chemistry."

Such was the state of opinion amongst English manufacturers fourteen years ago. It has undergone a great change since that time, and there are now very few large industrial establishments in this country which do not include amongst their partners, or principal members of their staff, one or more persons who are conversant with the sciences which underlie their technical operations.

The elements of physical science are taught with considerable success throughout the country in the various science classes affiliated to the Science and Art Department of South Kensington. The teachers of these classes are invited to receive more or less systematic instruction in the South Kensington Science School and in the Royal School of Mines.

Many of the larger towns have schools of art, and several hundred thousand children have been taught to draw in our elementary schools. Institutions, in which the application of science to manufactures is taught, exist in several places. University College and King's College have departments of applied science; there is a school of physical science at Newcastle-on-Tyne in connection with the University of Durham; the College of Science at Leeds has classes in which the art of weaving composite patterns is taught, and the London Guild of Clothworkers is giving liberal assistance to this school. The various Guilds of London have founded and endowed a special Institute for the promotion of applied science, to whose patronage we are indebted in some degree for the beautiful pottery now produced at Lambeth. It has also established a school for secondary instruction in science in the City of London; it is conducting examinations of rather questionable value in trade processes throughout the country; and the Prince of Wales is to lay the foundation stone this month of a great college, to be erected and carried out by the Guilds, in which teachers of the applied sciences are to be trained.

This same institute has recently published a little volume written

by Mr. Felkin, an English manufacturer resident at Chemnitz, in Saxony, describing the town, its industry, and the schools, in which the artisans of the town, and the manufacturers, managers, and foremen of the town and neighbourhood, receive elementary and technical instruction.

What is being done in this country shows that the special instruction of our manufacturing population is engaging public attention, and it may therefore be interesting to the readers of this review to know from Mr. Felkin what they are doing in a manufacturing district of Saxony; and Saxony may fairly be taken in this respect as a type of North Germany. What he tells us will suggest much that may be of service to ourselves. It will probably remove some popular errors as to the kind of instruction which the great mass of German artisans is receiving, and will enable us to form some estimate of the various influences affecting the commercial competition with which we have to contend.

Nothing can be more candid or more unassuming than the way in which Mr. Felkin tells his story. He is a native of Nottingham, and has, since 1861, carried on at Chemnitz the manufacture of hosiery, which is also the staple trade of his native place. Besides hosiery, woven fabrics of various kinds are produced. When he first knew the neighbourhood the mountain streams gave, as they still give, motion to numerous mills, in which the yarns consumed by the hosiers and weavers were spun. Many of these are now supplemented by steam-engines. But the hosiery itself was, until 1863 or 1864, produced almost exclusively on old-fashioned hand-loom and frames, which are now almost entirely superseded by the most recent mechanical contrivances of Nottingham and Loughborough, either imported from England or copied in Chemnitz from the latest English models. The town is in the very centre of the German Empire, of which every part is readily accessible by railway. Within a very few miles there is the coal-field of Zwickau, producing cheap and excellent fuel. The demand for railway locomotive-engines and for power-loom and frames has led to the creation of a prosperous establishment for the manufacture of these various machines—that of Mr. Hartmann, which gives employment to from 1,700 to 2,800 mechanics. Its central position and the cheapness of fuel have caused the workshops of the Saxon Government railways to be placed there. These employ 5,000 hands; and there are also works in which stationary steam-engines, jute spinning-frames, brewing machinery, engineering tools, and in fact all varieties of mechanical appliances, are produced. Mr. Felkin tells us, moreover, that, in their origin, several manufactories of Chemnitz are believed to have received assistance from the State in the shape of loans of capital.

He very properly omits any reference to the protective tariffs by

which they are supposed to be favoured ; for he tells us that they are able to sell their wares in neutral markets, such as the United States, South America, and Cuba, where, of course, they have no protection. Some of the Chemnitz wares are imported for consumption in England ; in the manufacture of gloves they have destroyed the trade of Nottingham ; and the Chemnitz manufacturers have lately combined and established an agency in Australia. In fact, thanks to its natural advantages and the skill and enterprise of the people, Chemnitz is one of the most rising centres of manufacturing industry. Its population has increased from 40,000, when Mr. Felkin first knew the town, to 90,000 in 1879 ; and it is estimated that an equally large number engaged in similar occupations, partly in factories and partly still in the homes of the workpeople, inhabit the surrounding villages.

Elementary education is, of course, compulsory in Chemnitz, as it is in every part of Germany ; and the children of the very poorest class attend the public elementary schools until at least the age of fourteen. After they have left the elementary schools and have gone to work they are still obliged to attend the Fortbildungs School two evenings in each week for two more years. They then become eligible for voluntary attendance in the schools for foremen, for the building trades, and for instruction in elementary drawing.

These elementary schools receive no assistance from the State ; the school fees vary from 7s. 3d. per annum in the lowest division, to 26s. 5d. in the highest class of the highest division. These fees cover about one-fourth of the cost of maintaining the schools ; the other three-quarters are borne by the municipality. Parallel with the ordinary public elementary schools there are schools of the same grade, but charging fees varying from 48s. to 60s. per annum, and these are attended by the children of the wealthier parents. The children of these schools and those of the ordinary elementary schools may, if qualified by examination, enter the classical school (the *Gymnasium*), or the modern school (the *Real Schule*), at the age of ten, or they may complete the elementary school course, and continue their education in one of the technical schools.

The regular course of instruction of the elementary schools, besides the subjects ordinarily taught in our own schools, includes moral and doctrinal religion, arithmetic, geometry, grammar, composition, history, natural history, geography, and gymnastics. The schools are managed by a board consisting of members of the municipality, of a clergyman, and three of the head-masters of the schools. The school district of Chemnitz, including a suburban area, contains 152,000 inhabitants, and of these rather more than 25,000, or one-sixth, attend the public elementary schools. Private elementary education, or indeed private instruction of any grade, is almost

unknown in Germany. The Gymnasium, which is one of the finest public buildings of the town, erected at a cost of about £13,000, is attended by 350 scholars, who receive instruction from a rector, a sub-rector, and 20 masters. Though essentially a classical school, its curriculum includes modern languages and physical science; and its leaving examination qualifies for entrance to the university. It is remarkable that, in a purely commercial town, so large a number of boys should receive so liberal an education. Parallel with the Gymnasium is the modern school, or Real Schule, erected by the municipality at a cost of nearly £18,000. It receives a subsidy of £600 per annum from the State. It has a director and 26 masters, and is attended by 430 scholars. Classics are not taught, but their place is taken by natural history, chemistry, physics, mathematics, mechanical and free-hand drawing of a grade, in the higher classes, sufficiently advanced to prepare the pupils for the Polytechnic and Mining Schools. The fees in each of these schools is £6 per annum. In addition to these primary and secondary schools there is a so-called public commercial school. This is a proprietary school. It has two divisions. The upper division has 56 scholars, admitted at the age of fourteen, whom it professes to prepare for a mercantile career. They are taught mercantile science—whatever that may mean—commercial law, chemical and mechanical technology, mercantile geography, modern languages, and other cognate subjects. The lower division is for apprentices, whose employers permit them to attend thirteen hours in the week. It has 170 scholars, who receive instruction of a more elementary kind in mercantile subjects. The roll of the schools for general instruction enumerated by Mr. Felkin terminates with an evening school, or Fortbildungs Schule, established by a workmen's union, in which the curriculum is rather more advanced than in the municipal schools of the same denomination. This school has about 1,900 scholars.

All the preceding schools are under the supreme direction of the Minister of Education and Public Worship. The three technical schools—namely, the Technical Institute, the Higher Weaving School, and the Agricultural School—are under the Minister of the Interior.

Of these, the Technical Institute is carried on in a building erected by the State at a cost of £82,000. The expense of its maintenance, in excess of the very moderate income derived from fees, is also borne by the State. The Higher Weaving School was erected by the municipality, but the State pays interest on the capital; and it is maintained by fees and subsidies of £150 each from the State and the town. The Agricultural School has only recently been founded by an Agricultural Society. It has a small grant from the State. The Technical Institute—the laboratories, lecture-rooms, libraries,

and museums of which are fully described and illustrated by plans in Mr. Felkin's book—may almost rank, so far as its *matériel* is concerned, with the more celebrated technical schools of Germany and Switzerland. It has four departments—the Higher Technical School, the School for Foremen, that for the building trades, and the Art School. The Higher Technical School has three branches—one for mechanical engineering, a second for chemical technology, and a third for architecture. Its courses, which are those of a polytechnic school, extend over seven *Semester*. The first three are general, and, with slight exceptions, common to all the branches. After this there is a trifurcation into special subjects adapted to the future professions of the students. These courses qualify for industrial employment and for the profession of an architect so far as private works are concerned; but for State employment in architecture the students have to complete their studies in the Bau-Academie of Dresden, or in some other German academy of equal rank. The fees are £3 per Semester, and there are 150 students. The School for Foremen has two winter courses each of half a year. It has two branches—one for mechanical and the other for chemical industry. The students are admitted at the age of sixteen and upwards, but must have worked at their trades at least two years before they can be received. They are for the most part young workmen, selected for their promise of excellence from the factories of the town and neighbourhood, who have received their education in its Public Elementary and Fortbildungs Schools; and the school is the nursery of the future foremen and managers of the district. There are 230 students, who pay 30s. for each course. This fee is frequently remitted, and young men of exceptionable merit are even maintained by the State during the time they attend the courses. These courses include arithmetic, geometry, physics, chemistry, mechanics, mechanical and chemical technology, the other usual subjects of technical instruction, and, in addition, German literature and book-keeping. Admission to the school for the building trades, like that for foremen, can only be obtained by young men who have worked practically at their trades for two years. The instruction is given during four winter courses, and, like that of the former, is adapted to the special requirements of the students, most of whom work at their trades during the other six months of the year. The number of students is 170, and the fees are the same as in the school for foremen. It is not necessary to describe the Art School, with its 110 students. The Higher Weaving School is one of several schools in Saxony having a like object, including a Hosiery School at Limbach. Of these the Chemnitz School appears to be the most important, and its courses are accordingly attended by young men from all parts of Europe, including the sons of large manufacturers of

Bradford, Huddersfield, and other English towns. It is held in a handsome building, and is managed by a committee consisting of two town councillors, of the director of the Higher Technical School, and one manufacturer. There are four teachers, of whom two are practical weavers. The number of students varies from 30 to 50. The course occupies two half-years, and the fee is £13 10s. It includes instruction in the properties of materials used in weaving, in the construction of looms, in the composition of patterns, and in drawing, &c.

The Agricultural School began in 1877 with 20 pupils; at the end of 1879 there were 60, and the number is still increasing. It is attended by the sons of small landowners and tenant-farmers, and is held in the winter months, so as to interfere as little as possible with the practical duties of the students; the classes appear to be calculated to supplement the defects of elementary instruction in the village schools, as well as to impart theoretical knowledge in agricultural subjects. Besides these schools there are others for mechanical weaving, intended for hand-loom weavers, held on Sundays, an evening school for practical tailoring, &c. &c.

Mr. Felkin, addressing himself more especially to the manufacturers of his native town, and reminding them that Chemnitz has already taken away its trade in gloves, and is slowly undermining that of hosiery—that this has been done by a race whom he describes as inferior to Englishmen in physical strength, in energy, and in natural ability—asks what it is “that has enabled the weaker race to take the bread out of the mouths of the stronger, and compete with it in the markets of the world?” and he thinks that the answer will be found to a great extent in the educational advantages which the people of Chemnitz share with other German towns.

I am inclined to think that, great as are these benefits, he rather exaggerates their share in contributing to the success of the Saxons as industrial competitors with this country. If we except those artisans who leave the ranks and become foremen, these have no technical instruction whatever, and, in spite of the advantage which they derive from the excellent elementary instruction of their public schools, they are described by Mr. Felkin as requiring much more supervision and direction than in England. And as to the foremen, managers, and proprietors of these Chemnitz factories, there is nothing in Mr. Felkin’s narrative to show that they have invented any important mechanism or process, or have even greatly improved those which they have imported from this country, where technical instruction is so much less developed. It is not yet ascertained whether the Nottingham lace-frame will succeed. Some years ago, Mr. Felkin tells us, it failed owing to want of technical knowledge amongst the workmen.

The only trade in which Nottingham has been actually beaten out of the field is that in gloves, probably the simplest and least technical of all those in which the two towns compete, and Mr. Felkin appears scarcely to attribute sufficient weight, as an element in competition, to the cheapness of wages in Saxony. It appears that in a locomotive and machine factory at Chemnitz the average weekly wages of the mechanics and labourers in 1869-70 were as low as 13s.; that they rose to 18s. in 1873-74, and have declined again to 16s. 4d. at the present time. He does not state the number of working hours; but I believe they are not less than sixty-six. I have ascertained that the average weekly wages in a similar factory in this country are more than 23s., or 40 per cent. above the Chemnitz rate, for fifty-four working hours; and that the lowest wages of its unskilled labourers are higher than the average of the skilled and unskilled in the Chemnitz workshop. Mr. Felkin does not give the wages in his own trade — that of hosiery; but I have good authority for stating that the same work costs from 15 to 20 per cent. more in wages at Nottingham than at Chemnitz. But no one would wish the comforts and enjoyments of our working people to be curtailed, nor is this to be feared whilst employment at high wages can be obtained to any extent in America and Australia. This very cheapness of wages abroad, therefore, only affords an additional reason why we should cultivate the natural abilities of our manufacturing population of every grade by giving them the opportunity of obtaining the most appropriate general and special education. For this purpose, Mr. Felkin tells us, no less a capital sum than a quarter of a million has been expended in a Saxon town of 90,000 inhabitants, which, important and prosperous though it be, is far inferior in rank and wealth to many of our own great industrial communities.

B. SAMUELSON.

THE LAND LAWS.

THE Fortnightly Review of March last contains an article from the pen of Mr. W. A. Jevons in which he maintains that, "If it can be shown that any improvement of which the Land Laws are susceptible (short of measures equivalent to confiscation), will not have the effect of materially altering the distribution of land, it will probably be generally acknowledged that a general agitation for reform of the Land Laws of such a nature as to make it one of the leading questions of the day, is not merely mistaken but mischievous," and assuming that the evils complained of are—First, the unequal distribution of land; and, secondly, that land is entailed or settled so as to prevent or impede its being sold, leased, or improved," he proceeds to argue with much force and clearness, "that inequality in distribution is not confined to land, but exists as to other descriptions of property, and is attributable to natural causes, and that the abolition of laws relating to primogeniture settlement and entail would not, as is popularly supposed, have any appreciable effect either in remedying inequalities in the distribution of land, or in removing restrictions on its transfer or improvement, but the contrary."

It is not my purpose to discuss those propositions. My object is to inquire whether, besides the two evils (inequality in division and entail) there is not a third arising not from natural causes, but entirely the creature of our Land Laws, namely, the insecurity, the costliness, the delays, and the cumbrousness of our system of conveyancing, which, though but lightly touched upon by Mr. Jevons, was denounced by Lord Brougham as "rendering the possession of land in small parcels a luxury which a rich man might indulge in, but a ruinous extravagance in the man of small means."

Mr. Jevons denies that the costs and difficulties of conveyancing have any deterrent effect, "for if so the result would show itself in the price, and land would, owing to the expense of dealing with it, command a less price in proportion than other investments offering an equally certain return." This inference is not warranted by the premises. All the world over, but especially in the contracted area of these islands, there are conditions arising out of the ownership of land which tend to enhance its price comparatively with that of other descriptions of property. For example, the feeling of exhilaration which most men experience when treading on their own land. The social status it confers, and the agreeable occupation it affords. These compensate the yeoman and the squire for the heavy costs and uncertainties of conveyancing as well as for the lower rate of interest than stock or railway debentures would afford him.

Again, it is urged that the security, cheapness, and expedition afforded by registration of title would not have the effect of encouraging a yeoman proprietary, because forsooth, "The tendency of the land market has been and is for land to be purchased by large owners and sold by small ones. The old English yeoman and the Cumberland statesman were holders of small farms, and they have to a great extent been bought out obviously for the reason that the money price of a small holding of land was worth more than the land itself."

That this consideration has had more or less influence in the direction indicated cannot be denied; but that the grievous yoke laid by the conveyancers on the neck of the small proprietors had at least an equal efficacy in the same direction is capable of demonstration. To the large proprietor purchasing his thousand acres, or mortgaging them for £30,000 to £40,000, the cost of conveyancing would probably not exceed $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; whilst the yeoman, purchasing his twenty acres, or mortgaging them for £100, might consider himself fortunate if the cost did not exceed 20 per cent. It cannot, therefore, be matter of surprise that the yeoman thus handicapped has been improved off the soil of these islands, and cannot be rehabilitated until a secure, cheap, and expeditious method—such as that by registration of titles, in operation in the colonies—has been substituted for the present system of conveyancing.

Mr. Jevons is much mistaken when he asserts that the principle of conveyancing by registration of title "was established in this country under Lord Westbury's Act in 1862, and still exists under the Land Transfer Act of 1875."

True these measures were ostensibly introduced with that object, but the permissive use of deeds given in the leading section (the 63rd) of Lord Westbury's Act involves a combination of two incompatible principles—"registration of deeds" and "registration of titles"—producing a hybrid measure which Sir Henry Thring (member of the Royal Commission of 1868) pronounced "to be entirely unworkable, and to differ little from an incomplete registration of assurances, and to possess all the disadvantages without any of the advantages of the numerous schemes formerly proposed for the registration of deeds, and therefore should be altogether discontinued."

The provision that no title should be accepted for registration, except such as a court of equity should hold to be a valid marketable title, has been justly complained of as causing unnecessary expense and delay, at the same time limiting seriously the scope of the measure, and depriving it of what has proved to be a most valuable provision of the Australian measure, namely, the conversion of good holding titles into indefeasible titles.

Finally, the official mechanism for carrying out the principle pre-

scribed in the fourteenth section is such that, after an experience of nearly twenty years in conducting registration of property in shipping and in land, I have no hesitation in describing as unworkable, giving occasion for errors and confusion such as no amount of vigilance could entirely prevent, and which Mr. Spencer Follett, himself the chief of the department, in his evidence before the Royal Commission of '68, repeated before the recent Committee of the Commons, declares to be so cumbrous and involved as "not to admit of its operating on any such scale as would render it of sufficient public advantage." The Act of 1875 is to some extent obnoxious to the same objections which caused the miscarriage of that introduced by Lord Westbury. Notably, Section 49 admits of conveyancing of registered land being carried on by deed for an indefinite period, whereas the principle of conveyancing by registration of titles is that the estate passes by the act of registration, and not as in these measures upon the signing of a deed.

Mr. Jevons commends the policy of the Legislature in "leaving the real practical cheapness and utility of the system to be tested in the natural way, that is, by leaving it to the inclination of buyers and sellers of land to avail themselves of it or otherwise." But he forgets that we are "an attorney-ridden people," and the result of giving, nominally to the proprietor, but practically to his solicitor, the option to place land under that system, or to withdraw it again from that system, is sufficient in itself to insure failure. How this operates may be seen by an occurrence communicated to me by an officer of the Recording of Titles Department in Ireland. A gentleman known to be an advocate for "Registration of Titles" applied at the office to remove his land from the record, and assigned as his reason that he required to mortgage, and the solicitor through whom the business was to be conducted insisted that the land should first be removed from the register, as under the old system he would be entitled to £50 as his costs, and under the Record of Title he could hardly claim as many shillings. This was by no means a solitary case. We are not, however, in a position to condemn professional men for opposing measures which, by the admission of the officials appointed to carry them out, are so defective and so "incapable of being worked upon any such scale as would render them of sufficient public advantage;" and when a method free from these defects is brought forward we must not look for any superhuman disinterestedness from conveyancers or any other class of men.

It would be difficult to imagine conditions more favourable for applying the system of conveyancing by registration of titles than those which exist in Ireland. An admirable Ordnance survey and the subdivision of the country into town lands afford the utmost

facilities for describing parcels and locating the property, the great difficulty we had to contend with in Australia. About a sixth of all the titles in Ireland have within a recent period been purged of all defects and obscurities by being passed through the alembic of the Estates Court. These when so passed are, to all intents, for the purpose of registration of titles, on all fours with the grants issued direct from the Crown in the colonies, and the people have been taught by experience to appreciate the value of indefeasible title.

In order to avail of these advantages, aided by Mr. H. D. Hutton, of the Irish Bar, and supported by a powerful association numbering several distinguished members of the Irish Bar, and having the late Duke of Leinster as its president, I drafted a Bill for applying my method of registration of title to all lands thenceforth passed through the Estates Courts. This Bill was read a first time in the sessions of 1863, introduced by the Right Hon. W. Monsell, now Lord Emly, and backed by the names of the Right Hon. H. Herbert and Sir Coleman O'Loughlin, both since deceased.

Unfortunately the legal gentlemen who undertook the revision of my Bill preparatory to its being introduced as a Government measure in the ensuing year, deemed it politic, in order to propitiate Lord Westbury, and induce him to undertake the carrying of it through the House of Lords, to import certain provisions of his own measure which were antagonistic to the principle of Registration of Titles. The result may be learned by reference to the evidence of Mr. Denny Umlin (an English barrister, formerly Examiner in the Estates Court, and for ten years in charge of the Record of Titles Department). He informed the Committee last sessions on Land Titles and Transfer, that "the Irish Act embodies all the mistakes of Lord Westbury's Act, which Lord Cairns's Act proposes to remedy, is an imperfect system, following rather closely Lord Westbury's system, and is permissive, so that any one signing a simple requisition could exclude the operation of the Act as regards his land on its passing through the Estates Court. Section 32 enables persons whose properties were upon the register to withdraw them at any period."

The same learned gentleman, at the recent Congress of the Social Science Association in Edinburgh, read a Paper on this question, from which I will quote the following passages, as deserving special attention of all who desire to see the Bright Clauses of the Irish Land Act operating successfully as designed by their benevolent author:—

"Years have passed away since it became clear to the practical mind of Sir R. R. Torrens that a registry might be established, giving to the owners of land all the advantages enjoyed by the owners of ships and fractional parts of ships. This task was rendered easier by the fact that most of the titles had a recent

origin in grants from the Crown. After a few years of most valuable experience gained in the colonies, the question arose, Why could not advantage be taken of the statutory grants made by the Land Court in Ireland? But opposition was strong, all the prejudices of a powerful professional class being aroused. The only legislation permitted was an Act of 1865, which, amongst other defects, had the important one of placing on record not all the titles granted by the court, but only such as their new owners chose to place on the record. It followed that the operation of the Act was excluded by the legal advisers of nine-tenths of the purchasers in the court. The whole number of titles on the new record does not reach eight hundred, an insignificant result in one sense, yet valuable in another; for experiment may be made on a small area as satisfactorily as on a large one; and a record which has proved effective for a few hundred of titles might be expanded and improved so as to be available for many thousands.

"Many unfortunate hindrances beset the course of this tentative Act of 1865. Only one of the judges of the Land Court took the slightest interest in the experiment: and the very distinguished and useful career of Judge Hargreave came prematurely to a close just as the machinery was getting into order. That was a fatal blow; for moral support and encouragement in official quarters was needed to counteract the prejudiced opposition from outside. The authorities refused to sanction the appointment of even one clerk for the new department, which was therefore tacked on as a kind of supplement to another office, and thrust away ignominiously into the smallest room of a range of buildings. This, and other circumstances equally unfavourable, led at once to the impression on the public mind that the Record of Title Act was not expected, or intended, to work largely. Such an impression once made could never be effaced, and the result was inevitable. So much for the limited operation of the Act. If the inquiry be made whether the expected results are attained in the case of the property actually brought under the Act, the answer is highly favourable. Mortgages can be effected quickly and inexpensively; and, better still, they can be satisfied and wiped off the record with even greater facility, and at the expense of a few shillings. Contracts for the absolute sale of plots of land have been made, carried through, and completed within the hour. The given folio of the record reveals all which affects the property, without searches elsewhere; and a short transfer deed and a new entry are only required to effect the change of ownership. The record itself is capable of simplification and improvement, for it was framed, and could not at that time have been otherwise than framed, after the model known as Lord Westbury's. But, in spite of all drawbacks, and of all the disfavour, official and professional, which have beset its history, I claim for it that it has given the true solution of the problem of land transfer in these countries. The general result, so far as Ireland is concerned, is that admirable opportunities have been thrown away, and several thousands of titles, after passing through the renovating process of the Land Court, are now year by year deteriorating, fast losing the signal benefit which was conferred, and becoming as cloudy and confused as titles were a quarter of a century ago. It is very unfortunate at the present moment that opportunities of this kind have been lost, and that land transfer is fast becoming almost as difficult and as costly in Ireland as it is elsewhere. For there are large numbers of Irish tenants ready to purchase their holdings, and the unhappy events of the last few months have rendered many landlords willing to sell at a reasonable price. The delay and cost is, however, such as to impede these transactions. I strongly recommend that existing methods be simplified in favour of such purchases by occupying tenants, and that the expense of them be reduced, as it might be, by two-thirds. Of course, an effective and compulsory registration of title should form part of the scheme, for it would be almost a mockery to subject these small freeholds to all the vexatious incidents of the ordinary system of conveyancing and real-property law, a branch of law which,

it may be remarked, is, except in a few minor details, the same in Ireland as in England. It is of high moment to the peace and welfare of the Empire that discontented tenants should be turned into satisfied and industrious freeholders; and if the legal process be simplified (as it might be), the operation might in numberless cases be carried through on terms satisfactory to the present landlords. From what I have endeavoured to express in the fewest possible words, it follows that simplification of existing methods, supplemented by a general registration of ownership, is especially important at the present moment. And what is required for Ireland at a critical time like this is equally suited for, and would be warmly welcomed by, small proprietors of land in other portions of the Empire."

The colony of South Australia was founded on the principle of locating a yeoman proprietary; but after a time it became apparent that, owing to the uncertainties, costs, and delays to which these small proprietors were subjected whenever they required to deal with their estates, the object of the founders was being frustrated and the above-quoted aphorism of Lord Brougham verified. The causes which, in the northern counties and in South Australia, tended to the extinction of a yeoman proprietary and the aggregation of land into a few hands must, ere long, bring about like results as regards the small proprietary proposed to be created under the Bright Clauses of the Irish Land Bill now before the House of Commons, unless preventive measures be promptly taken.

A short Act, repealing the Westbury Clauses of the "Record of Titles Ireland Act" of 1865, and substituting those of the Bill of 1863, before referred to, would suffice.

I repeat that, owing to favourable conditions there existing, the system of Registration of Title is much more ready of application to Irish estates than to those in the Colonies, where that system, tested by an experience of over twenty years, has been found adequate for every requirement and given general satisfaction; in proof of which it may suffice to refer to evidence given by Sir Arthur Blyth, Agent-General for South Australia, before Mr. Osborne Morgan's Committee of last year, as follows:—

"Registration of title is almost universal; for one transaction under deeds now there are a thousand under the Real Property Act; it is a curiosity if you get a person with deeds. To a person wanting to borrow money of me I should say to him first, 'Real Property Act, I suppose?' Then the next thing would be, 'You do not want a lawyer, I suppose?' He would probably say 'No.' I should accordingly say, 'Come with me to the Registry Office; you have got your certificate with you.' I should draw out a mortgage on the counter at the Registry Office, where printed forms are provided, and have it witnessed, and hand it in to the clerk, and say to him, 'It will be ready to-morrow afternoon, I suppose?' When the mortgage is paid off the transaction is even simpler. Supposing you were the mortgagor and I were the mortgagee. Before you gave me the money, I should sign this receipt before a well-known person, a credible witness, and give it to you, and let you go and clear your title. There is no necessity for the intervention of a lawyer; such a thing is never heard of. Marriage settlements are as common in the colony as here. In such cases as drawing wills and settlements the lawyers are called in; but in

ordinary transactions they have very little business except as brokers. They get a commission on that business, but not in respect to services connected with registering, transfer, mortgage, &c. The Torrens Act is just as popular in the other colonies as it is in ours. I notice in the Sydney papers, just at foot of advertisements for sales of land, that 'Torrens's Title' is always put. It seems to me that there is so great an advantage in the holders of property having a simple, intelligible, indefeasible title, as far as it can humanly be made, that no difficulties ought to stand in the way of carrying out such a wonderful reform."

The Committee in their report pronounce "Registration of Titles" "to be impossible in this country, unless an Act of Parliament be first passed prohibiting the owner of property from buying it up, or charging it, or dealing with it as his own;" and the learned Chairman, Mr. Osborne Morgan, in a recent article in the *Fortnightly*, affirms that "as, in Australia, settlements are rare and entails unknown, the first step for making 'Registration of Titles' practicable is to make a clean sweep of our present real property laws, and until this be done any further attempt to put Australian wine into English bottles, like all other legislation which ignores existing facts, will end, as such attempts have hitherto done, in failure and disappointment."

The statement that entails are unknown is erroneous, and the comparative rarity of these and of indirect settlements is due, not to any impossibility or even difficulty in conducting these operations under Registration of Titles, but to the necessity colonists are under during the early struggle of colonial life to reserve their land as an untrammelled basis of credit.

These struggles over, they feel the ground solid under their feet, the old country instincts to make provision for their families prevails, and settlements and entails cease to be even comparatively rare. The experience, though limited in the more recent settlements, has been amply sufficient to place the possibility and feasibility of the procedure beyond doubt.

The object aimed at as regards settlements is identical in the colonies and this country. The difference is solely in the procedure by which it is attained, and as in the case of mortgage, the fiction of conveying the legal estate when it is only intended to pawn or hypothecate, and releasing by a deed of reconveyance when only a receipt for the mortgage money is required; so in the case of settlements, the carving of a term of years out of the inheritance, amongst other venerable complexities, has been abandoned in favour of a simple procedure.

As this question of settlements has been put forward as fatal to the introduction of Registration of Titles in this country by conveyancers of high repute as well as by the Royal Commission of 1868, I will quote the very clear and able report of Mr. Henry Gusler, many years Examiner of Titles in South Australia, upon it.

"Settlements may be divided into two classes—First, those in which the legal estate is vested in trustees, the *cestuique trusts*, or persons beneficially interested, taking only equitable interests. This is the most common form of settlement at the present day. Second, those in which the persons beneficially interested take the legal estate in the land in possession or remainder, each one in his own right, without the intervention of trustees; and this is the form most commonly used when land is to be strictly entailed. Settlements under the first class most usually contain provisions empowering the trustees to sell or to make exchanges, and exempting purchasers from such trustees from all liability to inquire into the *bond fides* of any sale, or to see to the application of the purchase money; consequently, if the title of the trustees be otherwise correct, a purchaser from them cannot be ejected by the *cestuique trusts* on the ground of a breach of trust or improper sale by trustees. Under the Torrens Act such a settlement would be effected by the settlor conveying to the trustees by memorandum of transfer, and the trusts would be declared in the usual form, either in such memorandum of transfer or in a separate deed, and the trustees would receive a "declaration of title." Now in what respect would the *cestuique trusts* in this case be in a worse position than they would have been under the old system? In either case they must depend principally upon the honour of the trustees, and would only have a personal remedy in the event of a breach of trust. But *cestuique trusts* under the Torrens Act, so far from being in a worse position than they would have been under the old system, are actually in a better position, because they, or any person on their behalf, may enter a *caveat*, and so prevent any improper dealing by the trustees. This is the system adopted at the Bank of England in the case of stock in the funds, and it has been found by experience that property so circumstanced is practically safe. Can it be believed that what is safe for beneficial interests in such property will be otherwise than safe when applied to land? The second class of settlements can be effected under the Torrens Act with the same facility as under the old system. The Torrens Act in no way interferes with the principles or rules of law, or with the powers of landowners or their rights or liberties, but only with the machinery by which such rights or liberties may be created or protected, consequently the second class of settlements is fully and effectually provided for without the intervention of the Statute of Uses. Instead of conveying to A. for the use of B. for life, with remainder to the use of C. in fee, it conveys direct to B. for life, with remainder to C. Upon the execution of such a settlement the Recorder of Titles would issue a 'declaration of title' to the first tenant for life or owner of the first estate of freehold vested in position. Such declaration would set forth the nature of the estate, and all powers given to the tenant for life by the settlement, such as powers of appointing the fee or of releasing. Each remainderman, as his estate became vested in possession, would receive a declaration of title, and in the meantime he could deal with his interest, though a purchaser would not receive a declaration of title until the estate fell into possession. The only difference, in fact, between a settlement of land under the Torrens system and of land under the old system, is, that in the former case no estate would pass or become vested until the settlement was registered; but, so soon as registered, the settlement would have exactly the same effect; estates and interest would vest or be divested exactly as under the old system."

The space at my disposal does not admit of an exhaustive exposition of the method by which Registration of title has been thus successfully applied to lands in the Colonies. The following abstract from the provisions of the Bill of '63, applicable to Ireland, may suffice to convey a general knowledge of the procedure.

The Record is compiled by binding together the duplicates of all certificates of title issued by the Estates Court, representing the

freehold, together with the duplicates of all certificates of title issued upon the transfer or transmission of a freehold. Each of these duplicate certificates constitutes a distinct folium, two or more pages being annexed for recording together the memorials of all future dealings with any lesser estate or interests in that particular parcel of land. When the parcels are broken, a separate certificate is issued, and a fresh folium opened in the record for the transferee. On such occasions the portion of land transferred is notified by memorial on the certificate of the transferrer, or if he prefers it, or it be convenient, that certificate may be cancelled and a fresh one issued for the residue of the land, and upon it are carried forward the memorials of all lesser estates and interest affecting that residue which remain unextinguished at the date of registration. Entry of memorial of any dealing upon the appropriate folium constitutes recording of that transaction. Recorded estates are held subject to such liens, estates, and interests as are notified on the folium of the record constituted by the certificate of title, but free from all other charges, liens, or interests whatsoever. If the contracting proprietor does not attend personally at the Record Office and execute the agreement for transfer in presence of the Recorder, then the said proprietor or the person who attested his signature must acknowledge the execution before a notary public or commissioner for taking affidavits.

Certificates of title for whatever estate or interest in registered land are in duplicate, one retained in the Record Office, the other held by the registered proprietor. The latter must on the occasion of any dealing be delivered up to the Registrar, in order that endorsement may be made thereon, notifying such dealing corresponding with the memorial thereof in the Record.

Entry in the Record is the essential which gives validity to all transactions. The memorandum certifying Registration endorsed upon the certificate renders it conclusive evidence of title in all courts of law and equity. Registered interests take priority amongst themselves according to the date of registration, and over all unregistered interests whatsoever. Under this system every registered owner holds a certificate of title to the estate or interest in respect to which he is registered, which certificate discloses all that it concerns an intending purchaser or mortgagee to know, and bears a number or symbol indicating the volume and folium of the Record where its counterpart is bound up. By this simple expedient all difficulties, as regards indexing and search, the despair of other systems of registration, are solved. Admitting the absolute prevention of fraud to be impossible so long as knaves and dupes are found in the world, such frauds as were committed by Dimsdale, Roupel, and others, as also those for which special facilities are afforded under "Registration of Deeds," are rendered impossible, and the publicity

of transactions before public functionaries renders other descriptions of fraud more difficult, and detection more certain. Finally, the costs of conveyancing are reduced from pounds to shillings, and the time occupied from months to days.

The question remains, How may that method be applied to estates and interests in this country? And the Committee to which I have so often referred (page 6 of their Report) put the case very fairly thus: "On the whole, therefore, the position of the question appears to your Committee as follows: 'On the one hand we are informed, on the authority of Mr. Follett and Mr. Holt, that no system of Registration of Title can be devised which can be voluntarily adopted' (that is on account of the hostility of the profession); 'and on the other hand, we are told, by the Lord Chancellor, that he has not yet seen any way by which the system of Registration of Title could be made compulsory.'" (That is on account of the absence of any satisfactory mode for dealing with titles which are so defective that they cannot be placed on the Register as indefeasible.) The second of these difficulties has been successfully grappled with in the colony of Victoria by providing a separate Register for Titles of that description, and none of the injurious consequences predicted as incidental to that practice have arisen. Moreover, we have the authority of Lord Cairns, of Sir H. Thring, and a host of eminent conveyancers, "that such titles are extremely rare, so rare that they should not be allowed to bar the adoption of a measure of such enormous value to the community."

Happily we have in Ireland, and in this country, a considerable amount of land the titles to which are exempt from the difficulties and dangers suggested by the Committee. I refer to the Estate Court Titles in Ireland and the copyholds in England, and if the Legislature, notwithstanding the long and varied experience in the colonies, still shrink from applying the measure generally, then, at least, it may be applied *compulsorily* to those latter titles as a tentative measure free from all risk. Fully a sixth of all the lands in Ireland have received Estate Court Titles, but are daily accumulating fresh entanglements under the operation of existing law, inso-much that they require again and again to be passed through the court at heavy cost and loss of time.

Registration of titles by the method I have been endeavouring to explain would rescue the six hundred titles annually passing through the Copyhold Commission, and the far larger number passing through the Irish Estates Court, from the evils of the present system, and at the same time would render the Bright clauses of the Irish Land Bill a real boon to the small farmers, and solve the dilemma in which the Parliamentary Commission of 1879 represent the question to be placed.

ROBT. R. TORRENS.

BIMETALLISM AND FREE TRADE.

HENRY IV., listening to two of his Ministers who were with equal vehemence maintaining two opposite opinions, broke in with the exclamation, "*Ventre-saint gris!*" I believe you are both in the right." This is what the English public seem disposed to say, as it listens to the accounts of the various advantages now of bimetallism, now of monometallism. Unfortunately, we are not in this case in presence of an abstract question which is capable of being settled according to *a priori* formulæ or the deductive method. The statesman lives and acts under the empire of facts as they are and the traditions of the past, and every attempt to break violently with historic continuity would inevitably lead to crises of prolonged confusion and suffering.

From the furthest antiquity downwards, men have always used the two precious metals as monetary standards. The attempt to exclude one of them is therefore an assault upon natural facts revealed and confirmed by history. Nature has specially endowed two metals with the qualities which fit them to be made into money. All the treatises of political economy explain this, without recognising any difference between gold and silver. It will be enough for me to cite what Mr. Jevons has said on this subject in his excellent book on Money :—

"Of gold and silver especially we may say, with Turgot, that by the nature of things they were constituted the universal money, independently of all conventions and law."

When then you proscribe silver by law, it is a violation of "the nature of things." By some curious reversal of ideas, people have insisted on associating Free Trade with the English monetary system. It is, in fact, the contrary of this which is true. Independently of all convention and law, "gold and silver constitute the universal money." When you force men by law to make use only of gold, you do in truth go counter to the idea of Free Trade.

It is possible for human laws to violate natural laws; but the latter do not fail to avenge themselves by the sufferings that they inflict on men. This is exactly what happened after 1816 when England introduced the gold standard, and after 1873 when Germany tried to imitate England. On two different occasions the gold standard, established under identical circumstances, that is to say, at a moment when the production of gold was falling off, has produced evil of exactly the same kind. This point is so important that I am anxious to establish it clearly.

In 1816 silver was definitively excluded from circulation in England, and the office that had hitherto always been legally filled by that metal was henceforth laid upon gold alone. This was a violation of acquired rights, and a spoliation of the English people. According to the statutes the legal money was the pound of silver of Elizabeth. But an equivalent ratio having been established between gold and silver, all debtors, including taxpayers, had the right of discharging their debts either in gold or in silver. In 1816 this alternative was taken away from them, and they were forced to pay in gold alone; that is to say, in a metal of which the production was so scanty that it constituted an actual rarity, and which was made still scarcer and higher in price by the exclusive privilege that was thus accorded to it. This was a monstrous iniquity. We accuse socialists of wishing to plunder capital for the advantage of labour. Here was socialism of an inverted kind, not to the advantage of equality but of inequality, for labour was plundered in order to enrich capital, and the taxpayer was plundered to favour the fundholder.

The production of gold, which from 1741 to 1750 had risen to 3,400,000 pounds sterling, fell between 1811 and 1820 to 2,440,000 pounds, and in 1821—31 to 1,560,000. To replace paper currency by gold alone, England was obliged to withdraw from the commercial world a sum that relatively speaking was enormous. In the memorandum furnished to Parliament by the Bank directors in 1832 they give 20,000,000 as the amount they were obliged to purchase by the reduced price of commodities. This *prélèvement* was really enormous, for it represented thirteen times the total annual production, and the sixth part of all the gold circulating in the world at that time, which was estimated at 120,000,000 sterling. The result was a very sharp monetary contraction, and a great fall in prices took place in consequence.

The influence of a monetary contraction on prices is a phenomenon which is not yet sufficiently appreciated. Its disturbing effects, however, have been described by Roscher, by Nasse, by Mr. Dana Horton, and in the Report of the Silver Commission of the United States (1876). General Walker, the American delegate at the Monetary Conference of 1878, expressed himself on this subject in the following terms:—

“Yet even more important, in the view of the delegates from the United States, is the probable effect upon the production of wealth, resulting from the diminution of the money-supply of Europe and America already accomplished or in progress, through the gratuitous demonetization of silver. Cutting, as in the first instance it does, to the very quick into the profits of the entrepreneur, or man of business, which profits constitute the sole motive to production under the modern organization of industry, and enhancing, as in its ultimate operation it must, the burden of all debts and fixed charges, public, private, or corporate, which debts and charges are, in effect, the mortgage which the representatives of past production hold upon the production of current industry—a

diminution of the money-supply is one of the gravest evils which can menace mankind.

"The mischiefs of a contracting circulation have twice at least in the course of events befallen Europe as the result of the exhaustion of the mines of the precious metals, or the interruption of mining industry by barbarian invasion or civil convulsions. It has remained for this generation and this decade to see these mischiefs brought upon Europe by the deliberate acts of government under advice of political economists.

"Whether the money-supply of Europe and America would be reduced by the completion of the movement initiated in 1871, to the extent of 40, of 30, or of only 20 per cent., the consequences could not but be most disastrous. Suffocation, strangulation, are words hardly too strong to express the agony of the industrial body whom embraced in the fatal coils of a contracting money-supply. At a time when the production of the two historical money-metals, jointly, is diminishing, this most unfortunate occasion is taken to throw one of them out of use as money of full value; to remit it to uses of token money, and to banish what of the accumulated stock of three thousand years' production cannot thus be employed, to be hoarded in the East as treasure, or devoted to personal ornament."

In the decade which followed the definitive resumption of cash payments in England in 1821, there was produced in this country first, and afterwards all over the world, a disastrous fall in prices, and afterwards a frightful crisis. It was then that the "Inflationists" of the time clamoured for the reduction of the debt, and that Brougham proposed to reduce the contributions, and even to lower the sovereign from twenty to fourteen shillings. Mill still stopped on his way to combat these ideas. He says truly that such a transaction would have been a robbery; but to change the base of all contracts, and to oblige the nation to pay in gold, arbitrarily enhanced in value by this very act, that too was a robbery in an inverse sense. "The depreciation," says Mill,

"was represented to have averaged thirty or even fifty per cent." He adds afterwards—"The best authorities, among whom it is sufficient to name Mr. Cooke, have, after an elaborate investigation, satisfied themselves that the difference between paper and bullion was not greater than the enhancement in value of gold itself."

The enhancement in value of gold, producing the fall in prices, was so disastrous that an inquiry was ordered by Parliament. In the discussions which followed, Matthias Atwood said in the House of Commons (July 10, 1822) that all the values, moveable as well as immoveable, had gone down by one half.

Some clear-sighted men protested against the spoliation of the people when the Bill of 1816 was definitively voted by the House of Lords. Lord Lauderdale, who energetically resisted it, drew the following protest:—

"Because, in the present moment of our financial distress, and of the sufferings of the people from excessive taxation, the conduct of Government in undertaking a measure which must involve the Treasury in a great expense, and inflict even on the lowest and poorest orders of the impoverished people of this country a grievous burden, appears unaccountable; yet these cannot fail

to be consequences of now decriing and throwing out of circulation the coin which Parliament has so long suffered to remain in circulation."

The fall in prices, and consequently the distress of industry, and especially of agriculture, was so great that it provoked a vehement outcry, and even armed risings. Sismondi has depicted the universal crisis between 1820 and 1830 in terms which might serve to describe the crisis between 1873 and 1881 :—

"Un cri de détresse s'élève de toutes les villes manufacturières du vieux monde, et toutes les campagnes du nouveau monde lui répondent. Partout le commerce est frappé d'une même langueur ; partout il rencontre la même impossibilité de vendre. Il y a cinq ans, au moins, que la souffrance a commencé ; loin de se calmer, elle semble s'accroître par la durée. La détresse des manufacturiers est la plus cruelle, parce qu'à la différence des agriculteurs, leur subsistance tout entière dépend des échanges. C'est aussi un symptôme funeste de cette souffrance universelle que ces associations patriotiques que l'on voit se former en Belgique, en Allemagne, pour repousser les marchandises étrangères. Le système (protecteur) qui prévaut aujourd'hui dans l'opinion, c'est la détresse qu'on a partout sous les yeux qui l'a fait adopter."

After speaking of the sufferings of the artisans, Sismondi adds :—

"En même temps les fermiers et les propriétaires se plaignent de leur ruine ; ils demandent à grands cris des lois protectrices, des monopoles ; ils déclarent ne pouvoir soutenir la concurrence étrangère ; et, en effet, beaucoup de fermiers font faillite, beaucoup de propriétaires abandonnent volontairement le quart ou le tiers de leurs fermages. Enfin de fréquents incendies de récoltes et de maisons rurales annoncent l'irritation et la fermentation sourde des journaliers de l'agriculture et l'état précaire de toute la société."

Is not this an exact picture of the rural districts of England at the present time ?

Then as now, as a consequence of the dulness of trade, the rate of interest fell, and France profited by it to lower her debt from five to three, and England from four to three and a half. In the United States the distress was as great as in Europe, and people called for an augmentation of the Customs duties. There was the same demand for the protective system in France. The address of the Chamber of Deputies (Nov. 26, 1822) carries the grievances of the agriculturists to the foot of the throne, and adds : "The growing distress of the departments of the east, the west, and the south, proves that the measures taken too late against the importation of foreign cereals are insufficient." Not suspecting the mysterious and insidious cause, the monetary contraction, all the countries that were in distress ascribed the evil to foreign competition, and called for the exclusion of foreign goods.

In 1873—80 the same crisis ; the same effects, the same cause. Germany does in 1873 what England did in 1816. She expels silver, and replaces it by gold, precisely at the moment when the production of gold, as in 1816, had considerably fallen off. To show the disastrous effects produced by this step, and to measure the inten-

sity of the monetary contraction, I need only refer to the admirable accounts published in the *Journal of the Statistical Society* by Mr. Giffen (March, 1879), by Mr. Patterson (March, 1880), by Mr. Arthur Ellis in the *Statist*, and in the annual statement of the *Economist*. According to their calculation, the average of prices fell to the level of what they were in 1850. We can easily understand what losses and perturbations of every kind followed in the wake of this tremendous fall. The various taxes, charges, and obligations of all kinds, and the habits of society, remain the same, whilst to meet them income and profits had been reduced by at least one-third. Nowhere is the agricultural crisis more intense than in England, and nowhere less than in France. In that country the fall in prices was almost imperceptible. Is this because the general monetary contraction is felt less heavily in France, where the metallic circulation amounts to 310 millions sterling, than in England where it only reaches 194 millions? However this may be, the special works devoted in Germany to the elucidation of this point justify the assertion that it was certainly the adoption of this gold standard by that country which produced the fall in silver, by imposing elsewhere the suspension of the coinage of this metal, and which has thus been the original cause of the evil from which the whole world is suffering at the present moment.

The *Economist*, with the foresight that comes of the attentive study of facts, announced the crisis of 1880 with admirable precision in 1869. In its review of the previous year it says:—

“It may safely be affirmed that the present annual supply of £30,000,000 of gold is no more than sufficient to meet the requirements of the expanding commerce of the world, and prevent that pressure of transactions and commodities on the precious metals which means in practice *prices and wages constantly tending toward decline*. The real danger is that the present supply should fall off, and among the greatest and most salutary events that could now occur would be the discovery of rich gold deposits.”

. Instead of these gold discoveries, so necessary to the expanding commerce of the world, first, the annual production of gold fell off more than the half; and, secondly, the expulsion of silver by Germany increased the pressure on gold. In the review of the financial year 1872 (March, 1873) the *Economist* said:—

“By the present bill the German Government is certainly paying England the compliment of adopting its single gold standard; but the cost of the measure to the London and other money markets cannot but be great. As the annual supply of gold throughout the world is reckoned at little more than £20,000,000, and the annual demand for miscellaneous purposes is very large, it follows that if the German Government perseveres in its policy the strain upon the existing stocks and currency will be most severe; unless the annual production of gold should suddenly increase, the money markets of the world are likely to be perturbed by this bullion scarcity.”

Thus, then, according to the *Economist*, the monetary disorder

from which the world is at present suffering is caused by the adoption by Germany of the English system of a gold standard, at a time when the production of gold was diminishing. It is enough then that a single State should imitate the example set by England to inflict incalculable mischief on the world. What are we to think of a system that leads to such consequences?

The adoption of a gold standard by England in 1816 was not only a great iniquity in respect of the people of England, and of all debtors, it was a great economic blunder which has made itself felt in all its force from the moment when French bimetallism, which counterbalanced its effects, ceased to work. In reality the English system results in a surrender to incessant variations in value of that silver which is the money of India with its two hundred millions of inhabitants, as well as being the money of the majority of the nations with which England carries on three-quarters of its trade. This inconvenience, which is so grave that we may call it calamitous, was described by Lord Lauderdale in his protest in 1816, and also by Sir Robert Peel in his great speech on the reorganization of the Bank of England in 1844. Explaining the necessity of giving the Bank the privilege of issuing notes against silver, Peel set forth the advantages of bimetallism in this language :—

“The facility of exporting silver in preference to gold, when such export is expedient, is the true remedy against the inconvenience of our standard differing from that of other countries, and unless the circulation department is allowed to issue against silver, that inconvenience might occasionally be severely felt.”

Now that silver can no longer be coined at Paris, the Bank can no longer hold silver as an equivalent for its notes, and the gold standard being no longer sustained by bimetallism, makes trade feel all the drawbacks which were so justly anticipated by Lord Lauderdale and Sir Robert Peel.

The first bad effect of this variation in the value of silver reduced to the position of an article of commerce is the loss undergone by India in her remittances to England. The Indian Financial Department estimates the loss at 2,440,000 pounds sterling on an average, and this for eight years already amounts to a very considerable sum. But this loss will go on increasing for two reasons. 1. Because the remittances from India increase. This year they will amount to 17,000,000 sterling instead of 15,000,000. 2. If the Paris Conference does not end satisfactorily, silver cannot fail to lose in value in an unlimited proportion. America will not go on coining dollars which are not an international currency. The Bland Bill will be suspended, and 4,800,000 pounds' worth of silver will be sold annually

in London against an equivalent amount of gold. To what price silver will fall nobody can pretend to say.

But these losses, serious as they are for India, on which they inflict a financial situation that is pronounced to be alarming by those who are responsible for it, are nothing by the side of the losses inflicted on English commerce by the perpetual instability of the exchange. This point needs a word of explanation. A bill payable in gold has a certain basis, inasmuch as for an ounce of gold I can always obtain in London £3 17s. 10d. So long as the bimetallic system was in operation at Paris a bill payable in silver had a fixed basis, inasmuch as for a kilo of silver I should obtain at Paris 200 francs, which brought the ounce of silver at London to about 7s. 8d. Now that free mintage is at an end, and that bimetallism no longer exists anywhere, there is no longer a fixed ratio between gold and silver, and consequently the value of the silver-bond is always fluctuating. This is what kills trade. To be convinced of this, it is enough to read the petition of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, or a certain pamphlet, *Reasons for the Adoption of a Bimetallic Money System*. To describe the evil, I will borrow a few lines from the three most competent authorities on the subject. Mr. Henry Gibbs, a director of the Bank of England, in his admirable pamphlet, *The Double Standard*, says:—

“What is most to be dreaded, and, if possible, provided against, is a further depreciation in the value of silver. It is that further depreciation, and indeed any abnormal fluctuation which affects for evil the interests of all those in gold-using countries who have commercial dealings with silver-using countries. Such fluctuation, acting on the exchanges, imparts an additionally speculative character to their business; they can make no just estimate of what they have to receive for their goods; the thing that they do receive is for them a commodity, just as wool is, or bark, or silk, or tea. Neither more nor less. So the exchange of cotton goods, one kind of merchandise, for silver, another kind of merchandise, is but barter.”—*The Double Standard*, 6, 24, 27.

Commerce, not only with India but with four-fifths of the inhabitants of the globe, is therefore reduced to the elementary condition of barter.

Sir Louis Mallet, the delegate from India at the Paris Conference, expressed himself as follows:—

“For each operation two calculations must be made. First, you must calculate the price of the goods in gold, and then the price in silver; and there is no fixed basis for the value of this latter metal. It is exactly the same thing as if you had to buy cotton with gold in order to be able to buy wheat with this cotton. It is only a kind of barter adapted to a barbarous stage of civilization.”

Now listen to the consequences as described in the Memorandum of the Indian Finance Department, 1880. Speaking of the apprehension of fluctuations of the exchange, it says:—

"Not only are such apprehensions often sufficient to paralyse trade, and not only must repeated fluctuations cause serious and unmerited losses to honest traders, but, which is perhaps worse, uncertainty as to the international exchanges introduces an avoidable element of speculation, injurious to sober, prudent, honourable, and therefore permanently profitable commerce."

These fluctuations, said Mr. F. Stanhope in the House of Commons (22nd May, 1879), have the result that commercial transactions assume a character of pure speculation, not to say of gambling.

At present what is it that settles all over the world the rate for the negotiation of bills payable in silver? It is the price of silver at London. And what settles the price of silver quoted at London? Circumstances that are entirely trivial and insignificant, as Mr. H. Barclay shows in his *Letters on Bimetallism* (p. 22):—

"A number of shipments of silver arrive together at a moment when there is no demand. It draws up at once as against a dead wall, until it forces an outlet at a reduced price. A fortnight later there is no stock in the market, and some petty demand is able to raise up the price again 1 or 2 per cent. Meantime all the silver exchanges of the world are affected by these comparatively unimportant transactions. These silver exchanges for England alone represent something like two hundred millions, and double this total for the world. Is it not monstrous that the value of such immense transactions must depend now on some trifling speculations on the silver market of London?"

The consequences of a state of things so abnormal may be measured by figures. So long as the two metals were used, the export trade of England increased in a regular way. From 1836 to 1848 it remained nearly stationary at 53 millions sterling. But the influx of gold gives it an extraordinary stimulus: it rises to 64 millions in 1849, and continues to ascend rapidly from year to year up to 1872, when it reaches 256 millions. As soon as silver is proscribed, the exports decline until 1878, when they fall down to 193 millions. The whole decline is in the exports to the countries which have a silver currency. In fact, towards the gold countries they continue to increase a little, from 52 to 56 millions sterling, or about 9 per cent.; while the exports to the silver countries fall from 203 millions to 133 millions, or 33 per cent.¹

I think, then, that I have shown from the evidence of indisputable facts, figures, and authorities: (1) That the adoption of a gold standard has caused long, persistent, and calamitous crises, the first after 1816, the second after 1873: (2) that this measure has been, first in England, and next in Germany, an iniquity and a spoliation in respect of the nation and all debtors; (3) that a gold standard is leading the Indian treasury to bankruptcy, or the native taxpayers to misery; (4) that it causes the decline of English commerce by the intolerable instability which it introduces into the exchange with the silver currencies. But these evils, however great they are, still are nothing by the side of those which threaten

(1) All these details are to be found in Mr. Ernest Seyd's *The Decline of Prosperity*.

us, and even touch us already, for the gold standard is the death of Free Trade ; it means the struggle for gold succeeding the harmony of common interests ; it means antagonism between nations, and the conflict of tariffs.

As often as the arbitrary interference of a bad law rises up violently against natural and historic facts, it is inevitable that pernicious consequences should ensue. When Germany undertook in 1873 to expel silver, Wolowski and Seyd foretold that Free Trade would pay the penalty for it. The fall of prices, they said at the time, will lead those States which have payments to make abroad to decree protective duties, in order to obtain a favourable balance which will increase their monetary supply. This is exactly what happened after 1873, as it had happened after 1816. So long as both metals were used, and the influx of gold remained in operation, prices were remunerative, trade was active and successful, and consequently nobody was anywhere afraid of lowering duties. When silver was proscribed and gold became scarce, prices fell, manufacturers and agriculturists began to complain, to blame foreign competition, to insist on raising duties. It is in Germany especially that we best see how monetary contraction, by bringing about a crisis, makes people recur to protective duties. The gold that Germany had won at the price of such great sacrifices was flowing away. How could it be retained ? The example of the United States seemed to show the way : by hindering the entrance of foreign goods. Thus, having more to receive than to pay, gold would come back instead of fleeing away. At the present moment people are everywhere insisting on increased duties. England being the centre of the monetary movement, it is especially against her that they are bent on taking action. If Italy succeeds in establishing a gold currency, she will not fail to raise her duties, so that the exchange may not take her gold away from her. States have two means of preserving in the banks the necessary cash reserves : the raising of the rate of discount, or else Customs duties to create a favourable balance. England resorts to the first method alone, and she is right ; but the other States ought to raise the rate of discount much more than is necessary in London. Between such a rise as would hit the traders of other countries, and such a rise in the tariff as would hit the trade with other countries, there will be no hesitation. It is protection which will carry the day.

There is another source of peril. Several countries, like Russia and Austria, contract loans of which it is stipulated that the interest is payable in gold, because gold is now the only international metal. As these countries have in their domestic currency nothing but paper and silver, they seek gold from the Customs duties. In proportion as they run into debt they will be driven to increase duties,

since that is the only means they have of getting gold. If this metal, which only exists and can only be produced in an insufficient quantity, is to remain the only currency of civilised countries, the struggle for gold will assume a sharper and sharper character. The difficulties about the Treaty of Commerce with France give us a foretaste of this. Is not such a struggle a disgrace to our epoch?

The gold standard condemns those nations of the Continent which circumstances have reduced to the use of paper money to continue its use there. It is now certain that unless silver is restored to the place that it used to hold in the circulation, the Italian Loan, which is designed to abolish the *cours forcés*, will not be able to succeed. The restoration of the metallic circulation on the basis of gold would be then all the more impossible for Austria and Russia. We can understand the anger against the English system, which will become general among all the nations that are made the victims of a system that is false and mischievous.

But, say the English economists, let them be satisfied with silver. Is not such a sentence the condemnation of their theory? How can a monetary system, which is to remain the exclusive privilege of England, be true and conformable to the nature of things? Gold, you say, is the currency of the advanced nations, as silver is that of the backward nations; and at the same time you let it be understood that neither Germany, France, nor Italy ought to dream of adopting a gold standard. How nicely calculated such language is to create harmony between nations, and to prepare a favourable issue for commercial negotiations! Rightly did Michel Chevalier say—"If we consider a certain monetary system as good, we ought to wish that it should be adopted by all States." Mr. Giffen says, on the contrary:—"Still more we ought to deprecate any change in silver-coining countries in the direction of substituting gold for any part of the silver in use. It would be nothing short of calamitous to business if another demand for gold like the recent demands for Germany and the United States were now to spring up."

Thus, according to the present defenders of monometallism, the extension of the system that they declare to be the only one that is conformable to natural laws and scientific truth is nothing short of a calamity, and would produce a perturbation more disastrous than any of those which commercial history records for us. Does it not follow from this, without further discussion, that the gold standard is condemned? If other nations cannot adopt the English monetary system without provoking a commercial crisis, it is a manifest proof that the system is contrary to economic necessities and natural laws. Bimetallism, on the contrary—its adversaries do not deny it—would be all the stronger, and all the more advantageous, in proportion as it came to be adopted by more States. The gold standard leads then

to antagonism between nations; bimetallism to unity, fusion, and reconciliation of interests.

Mr. Gibbs, while defending bimetallism in practice by arguments that cannot be answered, says: "I have no doubt myself that, as a matter of theory, a single standard would be the best for the whole world of commerce." This opinion is that of the majority of bimetalists, and for a long time I shared it. I believe now that it is not well founded. Without doubt it appears more simple and more rational to have no more than one measure of values; but human affairs are not simple, and often in our desire to simplify we complicate and only produce disorder. The essential thing in currency is stability of value, because it is the base of prices and contracts. Rude variations are especially mischievous. It is scientifically shown, both by reasoning and by figures, that a currency composed of the two metals is more stable than if it rested upon only one of them. There is first what is called the compensating effect. It scarcely ever happens that gold and silver mines increase their production at the same time. On the contrary, we see that the production of silver compensates for the variations in the production of gold, in such a way that if we add up the production of the two metals together we obtain a much more regular total than by taking either one of them by itself. The compensatory action has been demonstrated by Mr. Jevons with mathematical conclusiveness.

"Nor is this the whole error of the English writers. A little reflection must show that MM. Wolowski and Courcelle-Seneuil are quite correct in urging that a *compensatory* or, as I should prefer to call it, *equilibratory* action, goes on under the French currency law, and tends to maintain both silver and gold more steady in value than would otherwise be the case."

According to the Memorandum of the Indian Finance Department there is in the world, in various forms, £1,519,482,000 of gold, and £1,558,398,000 of silver; in all, £3,077,880,000. It is evident that the annual variation in the production of one and the other metal will be one-half less perceptible in a mass of 3 than in one of 1½ milliards. The production of gold rises from 5 millions sterling in 1849, to 29 millions in 1856; that is, it almost sextupled. The production of silver rises from 9 millions in 1862, to 16 millions in 1877; it almost doubled. Consider, on the other hand, the total of the two metals from 1852 to 1876; it remains almost steady between 32 and 35 millions.

Suppose two reservoirs, one yellow, the other white, each holding a cubic metre of water. I add a cubic metre to the yellow vessel. The contents are doubled. Connect the two vessels by a pipe. The rise of level in the yellow vessel will be one-half less, and the contents of the two vessels thus connected will only have increased by a third. There are other illustrations equally conclusive. A popu-

lation that lives upon two kinds of cereals at the same time, rice and wheat for instance, will be less exposed to scarcity than if it lived solely either on wheat or rice, because it would scarcely ever happen that both crops should fail at the same time. Suppose that the existing monetary situation continues, where silver is universally proscribed, and, at the same time, what is far from being impossible, the production of gold falls to what seemed to be its normal level, what a frightful contraction in all prices, and what a convulsion in the commercial world! Thus, even from the point of view of theory, Mr. Gibbs is wrong in supposing that a single standard would be the best. It must be the reverse, inasmuch as it would be subjected to all the fluctuations of production, without the compensatory or equilibratory action so well described by Mr. Jevons.

Another error commonly spread abroad by English writers consists in believing that the relative value of the two precious metals is determined by production. We will show, first, that in fact this is not true, and that it is the legal tariffication of mints which has fixed their value; and secondly, we will explain why this is so. To begin with, here are the figures which I take from the undoubted authority of M. Soetbeer. In antiquity, gold is abundant enough, and yet a pound of gold is worth rather less than it is now, say 13 or 13½ times a pound of silver. In the Middle Age there is hardly any production of gold at all, and still it loses much of its value, for it is hardly worth more than 10 times its weight in silver. After the discovery of America, at first it is gold which flows in, and yet it increases in value so as to be worth 11 and 11½ times silver, instead of 10 times as in the Middle Age. The production of silver rises from 53 to 75 millions of marks between 1561 and 1600, and for all that the value of silver does not go down. From 1600 to 1700 the production of silver falls from 75 to 60 millions, while that of gold rises from 20 to 25 millions. Gold ought to have gone up, and silver to have gone down; exactly the contrary of this is what took place. During the eighteenth century the production of silver is tripled, and yet its value, which ought to have gone down, goes up, and if it falls from 1785, it is because the ratio of 1 to 15½, which Calonne established in France, increased the legal tariffication of gold. During the nineteenth century, a fact more conclusive still, gold is produced in tenfold annual quantity between 1840 and 1860, without any effect on its value. According to the Indian Memorandum, which I have quoted above, there must have been in the world in 1850, 15,557,539 pounds Troy of gold, and 339,828,926 of silver; and in 1878, 29,809,724 of gold, and 480,506,080 of silver. The mass of gold doubled; that of silver remains stationary, and nevertheless gold loses none of its value. These figures prove beyond refutation the error of those who make the relative value of the precious metals depend on produc-

tion ; it is solely the effect of the law, as I have proved elsewhere. The French Minister of 1803, M. Gaudin, has summed all this up in a sentence : " The price of the precious metals in commerce always regulates itself according to the price of gold at the Mint."

But when it is said that it is the law and not production which determines the value of the precious metals, are we not flying in the face of the generally admitted truths of political economy ? By no means : we are only applying what is laid down in all the books concerning the " monopoly price." When the production of a commodity is limited, as in the case of diamonds or antique statues, it is the demand which settles the price. The production of gold and silver is limited, and the Mints consume two-thirds of it. It is evident that if four or five great consumers, who take two-thirds or three-fourths of a product, agree to fix the price, then it is that price which will rule the market. If in all the Mints of the world we could obtain for a pound of gold the equivalent of $15\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of silver, and reciprocally, then their equivalent of value would necessarily impose itself upon commerce. What is called the market value is in truth simply Mint value.

It is incessantly repeated that gold takes the place of silver in consequence of the preference given to it, and notwithstanding the law. Thus the *Times* lately published a letter, which was supported by a leading article (May 2, 1881), and which said :—

"After 1717, the gold guineas took the place of the silver coinage, and continued to circulate at a price in silver higher than the intrinsic or market value of the gold contained in them. They did this without any law fixing their value, and in spite of the law which made silver the legal tender. People preferred gold and kept to them."

There are almost as many mistakes as words. If gold has invaded the circulation and replaced silver, it is not in spite of the law, but according to the law ; not according to the preferences of the people, but in spite of them. The writer seems to forget the Gresham law, according to which it is the rebutted coinage which remains, and the desired coinage which is exported. This desired coinage was then silver, as Newton explains in his famous *Report concerning the State of the Silver and Gold Coins* (1717).

"As often as men are necessitated to send away money for answering debts abroad, there will be a temptation to send away silver rather than gold, because of the profit, which is almost 4 per cent. ; and for the same reason, foreigners will choose to send hither their gold rather than their silver."

The proclamations of the King at the same date show us that they regretted extremely the exportation of silver, and in order to retain it they lower by sixpence the value of the guinea. As in England they got for a pound of gold $15\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of silver at a time when on the Continent they only received $14\frac{1}{2}$, it was perfectly natural that

silver should leave England. If at the present day the right of coining were free in France and the United States, gold would go to the United States, where it would obtain sixteen times its weight, and silver would go to France, where the tariff price is higher. When in 1717 they lowered the value of the guinea by sixpence, Newton foresaw that the reduction would be insufficient, and in fact during the eighteenth century silver was at a premium in England, and a clandestine trade introduced gold into this kingdom. In the House of Lords, Jan. 18, 1718, Lord Stanhope shows among the reasons for the scarcity of silver, that they deplored "the clandestine trade that had been carried on of exporting silver and importing gold to and from Holland, Germany, and other parts." There only remained in circulation the worse silver pieces. Those which possessed their proper weight were either melted or carried abroad.

The double standard is reproached with being in fact an alternative standard. That is true if you change the ratio between gold and silver in different countries. Thus up to the end of the last century it was found that according to the Gresham law the metal flowed towards the place where it was quoted at its highest. The best example was furnished by the monetary history of the United States. The first monetary law, voted by Congress under the inspiration of Hamilton, settled the ratio of 1 to 15, at a time when France had the ratio of 1 to 15½. Silver being worth more in the United States, goes there to replace the gold which comes to France. After 1834 Congress establishes the ratio of 1 to 16. Silver being now only worth one-sixteenth of the value of gold, emigrates to France, where it is worth fifteen and a half times the value of gold. M. Cernuschi sums up the history of the past perfectly in the words, "*Two bimetallisms of different ratios cannot work simultaneously on the face of the earth.*"

Still, French bimetallism was powerful enough to maintain itself alone for seventy years. According to M. Soetbeer it could have withstood the increase in the production of silver, and even the sales of this metal on the part of Germany in 1873, as it had resisted the immense influx of gold after 1850. For seventy years the French law maintained the ratio of 1 to 15½, for M. Seyd has shown by the exact figures that the fluctuations in the price of silver quoted in the London market, varying between 59 and 62 pence, represented only the necessary expenses of the transport of silver between London and Paris. The money-market price was maintained where the true market was, namely at Paris. Nor is it accurate, as Mr. Giffen has contended, to say that France was deprived alternatively of silver and of gold. The unanswerable proof of this is that according to the financial statement made in 1878 they found in the public treasury about 824,789 five-franc pieces, of which 517,700 were of a date

anterior to 1851, when the drain of silver began. This drain then did not carry off the third of the silver. Two-thirds remained, and five millions of gold came to be added to them as a result of favourable commercial balances. However this may be, it is evident that the alternations with which bimetallism is reproached have been the result of the difference of the ratio of equivalency established between gold and silver in different countries. The remedy for the inconvenience is indicated by the nature of the cause which produced it. It consists in the general establishment of an identical ratio, and in this consists the international bimetallism at $15\frac{1}{2}$, which is explained and defended by M. Cernuschi. But the writer who first pointed out this remedy is no other than Newton:—

“If gold in England or silver in East India could be brought down so low as to bear the same proportion to one another in both places, there would be no greater demand for silver than for gold to be exported to India; and if gold were lowered here only so as to have the same proportion to the silver money in England which it hath to silver in the rest of Europe, there would be no temptation to export silver rather than gold to any other part of Europe.”

The inventor, then, of Bimetallism—that is to say, of the law which presides over the movement of the precious metals—is no less than the immortal genius who discovered the law that presides over the movement of the heavenly bodies. International bimetallism once adopted, the alternation is no longer possible, for whither would anybody find a profit in either the gold or the silver that he wished to export?

But would there be nothing to fear from an enormous increase in the production of gold or silver? It is impossible to imagine a second metallic influx greater or more unforeseen than that which took place after 1850. Yet no confusion followed that; it increased the circulation in France, and favoured the development of business all over the world, as Tooke showed in his *History of Prices*. The repetition of a similar event, which was unable to overthrow bimetallism when established in France alone, would surely have no effect upon international bimetallism.

Bimetallism is unjust, they say, for it permits the debtor to pay in the cheaper metal. If this objection were well founded, is it possible that the French creditors, showing themselves more stupid than other people, would have for seventy years allowed themselves to be duped without uttering a complaint? In our Latin bimetallic Union we have no idea of a cheaper metal. The two metals having exactly the same liberating and acquiring power, how could a difference arise? We pay as in England by bank-notes secured by gold and silver together. The note for a thousand francs has nothing to do with the cheaper or the dearer metal. When the

banker settles the account of his clients, does he put to the debit of one of them the dearer, and to the credit of the other the cheaper metal? The thing is absurd.

The only chance for bimetallists, says Mr. Giffen, is the possibility of their scheme being tried; but can any one dream of such a consummation? This is so little of a dream that it only needs a word from England to establish bimetallic union to-morrow. It is Mr. Gibbs who says as much. "If our Government could say, 'England is willing,' no one will doubt that France, with the Latin Union, Austria, and the United States, would at once agree, and it is confidently assumed that Germany would do so also." To these we may add Spain, Holland, and all the Danubian States.

But who will fix the ratio? Will anybody be found to contend that the ratio of 1 to 15½ is the result of a providential arrangement? Providence has never been invoked on the subject. This ratio was established at the end of the last century. France adopted it; it exists in Germany. In England even it is considered the normal balance in all calculations where silver is concerned. From all sides people accept 15½ as a settled point, and so far there is no evidence that we need be afraid of.

There is no need to write a long answer to Mr. Jevons's article in the *Contemporary Review* of May last. The only point that I should like to establish against Mr. Jevons's view is that currency is not what is commonly called merchandise. In its essence it is a common measure of value and a means of payment established by law. As both Aristotle and the jurisconsult, Paulus, have admirably shown, it is valuable by quantity and not by matter. *Materia electa est, eaque materia, formâ publicâ percussa, usum dominiumque non tam ex substantiâ præbet quam ex quantitate.* If this quantity is maintained at the level of the needs of the exchange, paper money being convertible and without intrinsic value, can keep itself at par, as for example in France in 1848 and after 1870. In their exchanges everything reduces itself to barter, goods trucked against goods; and the instrument of their barter may be a word, a promise, or a line of writing in the books of the banker, a bank-note, a metal disc. The advantage of employing metal discs is that they constitute an equivalent of the object exchanged, and that the quantity of it is regulated by nature, and not by the arbitrary decree of the State; but nevertheless does the currency preserve its essential character of legal institution. In so far as it is composed of gold and silver, it participates in a certain measure in the nature of mercantile commodities. But we must add that it is a commodity which in itself, and by the monetary office which is conferred upon it, differs from other commodities in various ways. 1. It has a value fixed by the Mint, which remains invariable. Gold in London is always £3 17s. 10d.

an ounce. The price of commodities fluctuates incessantly, because it is not regulated by law. 2. Commodities produced in excess do not find a buyer. A metal which is capable of being freely coined always finds somebody to take it, for no merchant ever refuses to accept legal currency. 3. The increase of currency can never end in a glut, but only in a rise of price. 4. The abundance of currency corrects itself automatically, first because the increased prices require more for the exchange, and in the second place the activity that is imparted to business absorbs and utilises the excess, as Tooke and Newmarch have shown. 5. The production of the precious metals, being limited by nature, cannot be augmented at pleasure. 6. We utilise ordinary commodities by consuming them, and the precious metals by preserving them. The existing mass, the base of prices, especially when both gold and silver are employed, is so enormous that the annual fluctuations in their production remain without appreciable effect. 7. The Mints being the great consumers of the precious metals, it is the Mint regulations which have always determined their value; history proves it. These differences between currency and mercantile commodities are met with; whoever refuses to take them into account will infallibly go wrong in all his arguments, and will find himself contradicted by the observation of facts.

I am convinced that if the English economists would consent to abandon the abstractions of the deductive method to study history and actual facts, they would perceive that bimetallism is conformable to nature and to the truths that are established by economic science. What this, I think, justifies me in supposing is, that the thorough study of the question has converted to bimetallism the principal and the most scientific economists of Germany, Italy, Holland, and the United States, and the directors of all the great European banks. I doubt whether it is very becoming to apply the epithet of "Lunatics" to these masters of the science and practice of finance. Many monometallists have been converted to bimetallism, and they are not among the least distinguished. I scarcely know a bimetallist who has been converted to monometallism. Are we not warranted in seeing in this new evidence of the power of truth?

What distresses me is the indifferent and contemptuous fashion in which the English economists treat a question on which depends the future of commerce and the prosperity of the world. They do not see that the problem has passed into the acute stage. There is accumulating at this moment over the whole of the continent a fund of silent but intense irritation against the English system, which reduces certain States to paper currency; which has thrown Germany into the path of a monetary reform that cannot be carried out; which threatens the Latin Union with grave difficulties; and which produces everywhere the calamitous phenomenon of a steady and per-

sistent fall of prices. The irresistible consequence of the struggle for gold that we see in progress under our eyes is that all these States will feel a desire to take measures of defence and self-protection. A new continental blockade will be set up against England, not by the will of a tyrant, but by the popular instinct of self-preservation. On the side of America the danger is still greater. Mr. Gibbs has written a sentence that is alarming in its truthfulness: "*The question is being gradually narrowed to a monetary struggle between America and Europe.*" In fact we are already face to face with the question of which Messrs. Goschen, Bagehot, Giffen, and Jevons have never ceased to indicate the danger. Gold is the only international currency, and we can only restore to silver the position which all recognise as indispensable, by the unanimous consent of all the civilised States. If gold continues to be absorbed by America at the same time that its production diminishes, what is to become of commerce and industry, crushed on the one hand by the growing productive powers of America, and on the other by the restrictive measures of all sorts to which distress will lead the States of the Continent?

EMILÉ DE LAVELEYE.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

EVENTS in France have taken a remarkable turn, the full significance of which is not yet apparent. On the 19th May, the Chamber of Deputies voting by secret ballot immediately after a speech of reasoned eloquence by M. Gambetta, who left the President's chair to occupy the Tribune, carried M. Bardoux's proposition substituting *scrutin de liste* for *scrutin d'arrondissement* by the narrow majority of eight votes. Immediately afterwards an open vote was taken on the first clause of the Bill, when the majority rose to sixty-eight; for in France, as elsewhere, "waiters upon Providence" are, a numerous race, and many a deputy who voted "no" in secret was not ashamed to go over to the winning side when voting under the eye of the Grand Director of the coming Elections. For the moment the triumph of M. Gambetta seemed to be complete. It was assumed as a matter of course that the decision of the Chamber, on a subject peculiarly concerning itself, would not be disputed by the Senate, where the Republicans have a small but assured majority. All over France the Republicans in each department began to prepare for the general election under the *liste* system, by nominating those departmental electoral committees to whose hands would be intrusted the selection of candidates. In the first flush of his victory, M. Gambetta made a triumphal progress to Cahors, where he was received with almost royal honours. At every station on his route he was welcomed by cheering crowds, and at his birthplace the demonstration of enthusiasm knew no bounds. France, it was said, acclaimed her future ruler, and rejoiced at the prospect of being governed by the one statesman in whose sagacity and courage she had never been disappointed. Standing as it were on the steps of the throne—if a metaphor familiar to those who are under a monarchy may be employed in speaking of a land where monarchy is happily defunct—the great Republican who had never despaired of France in the darkest hour of her destinies, or of the Republic when it was assailed by the coalesced forces of civil and religious authority, spoke with unusual soberness and moderation. His speeches—for he made three—were those of a man who feels already the burden and the responsibility of power. No trace of the *fou furieux* of M. Thiers is visible in the earnest but subdued fervour of the Cahors orations. Addressing himself primarily to the peasants of Imperialist traditions—for Cahors is the Midlothian of Bonapartism—he set forth in the hearing of all France a programme of progress so tempered by prudence as to delight the heart of an

English Whig, while not abating in the least—with one exception—his devotion to his earlier ideals. The one exception was his defence of the Senate which eight years before he had denounced as a menace to universal suffrage and inconsistent with the true democratic ideas of national sovereignty. He expressed a confident belief that the Senate would accept the Scrutin Bill, and after declaring emphatically against the revision of the Constitution, bade his hearers, who included all the Republicans of France, to respect the Senate, for some day it might become their supreme resource.

After being fêted and applauded to satiety, M. Gambetta hurried back to Paris, to take part, according to report, in the debate on M. Clemenceau's proposal to revise the Constitution by suppressing the Senate. The day before M. Clemenceau's speech the rumour spread that the Senate, taking alarm at the progress to Cahors, and unmollified by the compliments of the hero of the hour, had determined to reject the Bardoux proposition. If M. Gambetta had intended to repeat in the Chamber the arguments he had used at Cahors, the report of the hostility of the Senate sealed his lips, and he listened in silence to the remarkable speech of the able leader of the reasonable Radicalism of France, in which one-third of the arguments were quoted textually from his own speech against the institution of a Senate in 1873. M. Clemenceau's speech, though a parliamentary success, did not prevent the rejection of his motion. Even if the Republicans as a body had adhered to the Republican tradition of 1848 and 1873, they would have hesitated to assail the existence of a Second Chamber at the moment when the Senate was about to deal with an Electoral Reform Bill. It was soon proved that the Senate meant mischief. A Commission was appointed to report on the Bill, consisting of eight avowed opponents and one supporter. It is significant of the extent to which opinion varies on the question of *liste* voting, that four or five of the hostile Senators commissioned to report against M. Bardoux's proposition had supported scrutin de liste against the Monarchists in 1875. But at that time the Republican party, including M. Grévy, was united in supporting large plurinominal, as opposed to small uninominal constituencies. M. Waddington, who was named reporter, lost no time in drawing up a severe and sweeping indictment against the proposal, and indirectly against M. Gambetta, who it was suggested was preparing a plebiscite to secure a dictatorship. The Senate was entreated to veto the Cæsarean Republic by preserving intact an electoral system which forbade the excessive predominance of a single individual. Even to the last moment it was not believed that the Senators would dare to run counter to the declared will of the most powerful statesman in France and the vote of the Chamber.

Ministers were neutral and silent. The President, although notoriously hostile to M. Bardoux's proposition, scrupulously preserved an attitude of an interested but inactive observer. M. Gambetta's organs blustered and threatened the Senate with extinction if it ventured to assert its existence. On the very morning of the division the leading Republican papers assumed as almost a matter of course that the Bill would be passed. They were speedily and rudely undeceived. On the 9th of June, after a brief debate, the Senate voting by secret ballot, threw out the Bill by 148 votes to 114.

It was a severe, and, to M. Gambetta, a most unexpected blow. Utterly disconcerted, and for once thrown off his guard, he seems to have thought of retrieving his position by bringing about a speedy dissolution, or to speak more correctly, to expedite the appeal to the constituencies so as to take the general election before the old Chamber was dissolved. By this means it was thought the country could make its wishes known upon the rival scrutins, and a speedy termination put to a situation which might result in serious difficulties. It was an ill-conceived project, and it was intrusted to an unlucky politician. M. Bardoux, however, had hardly formulated the scheme before it was rejected by an overwhelming majority of the Republican deputies, and M. Gambetta found himself confronted by a reverse in the Chamber immediately after the rebuff in the Senate. A cry of indignation and of wrath against President Grévy escaped from him in the columns of the *Voltaire* through the pen of M. Ranc, and the *République Française* declared that the elections must be taken on the revision of the constitution of the Senate. Life Senatorships should be abolished, representation adjusted to population, and so forth. The programme may be intrinsically sound, but it was hardly calculated to efface the memory of a blow administered with impunity to the prestige of M. Gambetta. It was ridiculed as trivial by M. Clemenceau, and contemned as lacking actuality by the Conservatives. M. Clemenceau, who knows his own mind and waits his own time, rejoiced at the discomfiture of M. Gambetta, believing that the reverse suffered at the hands of the reactionary Senate would eventually force M. Gambetta back to his old position at the head of the advanced Republicans. On very different grounds the Conservatives of all shades exulted in the rebuff inflicted upon the hated and dreaded leader of the popular party. A few wiser than the rest pointed out that, at the best, it merely prolonged the period during which M. Gambetta would continue to exercise power without place or responsibility, and drew their own conclusions as to the inopportuneness of a "victory" the tendency of which drove the Opportunist leader back from Conservatism upon Radicalism. Meanwhile the

temporary eclipse of M. Gambetta encouraged M. Ferry to entertain hopes of which he would not have ventured to dream six weeks since. Addressing his constituents at dinner at Epinal, he delivered a political manifesto which seems to be either singularly bold or still more singularly rash. Exulting over the powerlessness of the Radical party, he predicted that the elections would not be fought over either on the ground of revision or of division—a matter on which M. Ferry's opinion is worth little, and his authority worth less. If M. Gambetta chooses to appeal to the country on the ground of Revision, the action of the timid Republicans in the Senate will necessitate Division.

That M. Gambetta has no intention to allow the leadership of the Republican party to be wrested from his hands was evident to every one but M. Ferry before the unlucky speech at Epinal; but even M. Ferry must have been convinced that he had counted without his host when he read the brief but significant speech which M. Gambetta addressed to a Democratic reunion in St. Mandé the day after M. Ferry's escapade in the Vosges. While disclaiming all intention prematurely to enter on a political campaign, M. Gambetta pledged himself to appeal for re-election to his democratic constituents at Belleville, and declared that reverses only rendered it the more necessary to resume the struggle with fresh ardour. No one doubts that M. Gambetta will be as good as his word, and the spectacle of M. Ferry aspiring to lead the Republican party as a moderate supporter of a stationary Republic, in opposition to M. Gambetta, stimulated by defeat to combat with redoubled energy for the Republic of Progress and Reform, is one which excites more pity than interest. M. Ferry is not the first Minister of the Republic who has mistaken place for power, and has, as a consequence, been somewhat rudely undeceived.

The expiring parliament has remitted taxes amounting to over eleven millions sterling, redeemed a milliard of debt, devoted £60,000,000 to public works—spending over the latter £1,600,000 more per annum than the Empire—and closes its accounts with a surplus of two millions sterling. France has regained her place among the nations. Even the deplorable Tunis expedition proved that she dare transgress with a high hand. While absorbing Tunis, she has annexed Tahiti, and is extending her influence in Eastern and Western Africa and the Further East. The war against Clericalism, marked as it has been by many unfortunate features, seems to have provoked no perceptible reaction, while it gratified the *odium anti-theologicum* of the most energetic Republicans. Education has been made free, compulsory, and secular. Steps have been taken to shorten the period of military service. Order has been maintained without the sacrifice of liberty, and the peasants have

learned to identify the Republic with prosperity and peace. The monarchical factions are disunited. The Bonapartists are practically without a chief, and there is no man in all France who can speak to the nation with the authority and the prestige, to say nothing of the eloquence, of M. Gambetta. Nothing short of a wide split in the Republican party can endanger his success at the coming elections, and that split neither M. Ferry, nor M. Grévy and M. Ferry combined, are strong enough to bring about.

This summer promises to be remarkable for the number of general elections which will take place. Of the French elections we have already spoken. The Dutch general election which took place in June turned upon the question of secular education. The majority in favour of secular education has returned from the polls with an almost imperceptible diminution of their numbers, losing only three seats to a coalition of ultra Protestants and Catholics. In Belgium the Liberals are seeking by a naturalization law to increase their electoral strength by placing on the register the Germans, for the most part Liberals, who have settled in Antwerp and Ghent. In Hungary the general elections, which commenced last month, turn almost exclusively upon the question of confidence or no confidence in M. Tisza, whose administration is assailed and defended on grounds which may be interesting to Hungarians, but which are too minute and local to be easily intelligible outside the kingdom. It is otherwise in the pending elections in the petty principality of Bulgaria, where the issue raised by the appeal of the Prince to his subjects has been keenly discussed in every country in Europe, and nowhere more keenly than in England. Prince Alexander finding, as he says, that the result of three years' working of the extremely democratic constitution adopted by the Bulgarian Assembly of Tirnova was disorganization at home and discredit abroad, appealed to his subjects to elect a National Assembly to decide between him and the impeachable constitution. He declared that it was his intention to "ask the National Assembly to choose purely and simply between the ratification of three articles taken collectively and his abdication." The three articles were: 1. His investiture with extraordinary powers for seven years for the creation of new institutions, among others of a Council of State *pris dans le sein du peuple bulgare*, to which the government of the country should practically be intrusted. 2. The suspension of this year's ordinary session of the Assembly, and the budget voted this year to continue law over next; and lastly, a great National Assembly to be convoked to revise the constitution before the seven years' period expires. M. Zancoff, the leader of the Radicals, replied by proposing to suspend the constitution for a period of three years, during which the Prince should govern by his

Council of State, but that to this Council he proposed there should be attached a Ministry elected by the Assembly. Both propositions admit the necessity of amending the existing system, which appears in many respects unsuited to the necessities of a small principality, but yesterday liberated from the servitude of centuries, where race passions are strong, popular ignorance dense, and the majority of the peasants totally unaccustomed to constitutional methods. The most intelligent section of the population was torn off from the principality at the Congress of Berlin, and the working of the extremely democratic constitution has been attended by many difficulties. According to the constitution the proposal for revision should have emanated from the Bulgarian Assembly. In France opinion differs as to the merits of the question. Italy is preoccupied with her own affairs. In England the passions excited by Bulgaria five years ago are not yet extinct, and the action of Alexander of Battenburg is more fiercely assailed and more warmly commended than in any other country.

The Spanish Ministry, which has resolved to levy taxes unconstitutionally rather than risk the inconveniences of summoning the late Cortes, in which its opponents possessed a commanding majority, has fixed the elections for the Cortes on the 21st of August. The Senate will be elected on September 4th, and the Cortes will meet sixteen days later. A bill of indemnity will be passed for the illegal levying of taxes, and thanks to the manipulation of the constituencies, there is no doubt entertained as to the election of a majority which will condone everything the Administration has done. Constitutional Government and popular representation seem hardly to have struck deep roots in Spanish soil, for every election is but the echo of the voice of the Administration. The late Cortes was as Conservative as the new Cortes is likely to be Liberal, and if, by any strange turn of the wheel, Don Carlos or Señor Zorrilla were able to wield the power of the Spanish Administration, there is little doubt that they would succeed in securing the election of a Cortes, Carlist or Republican, as the case might be. Owing to the division in the ranks of the Conservatives—the Carlists refusing to coalesce cordially with the Catholic Union—and the support extended to the Administration by Señor Castelar and the moderate Republicans, the chief electoral difficulty of Señor Sagasta is not the paucity but the multiplicity of his supporters. It is stated that one of the first tasks of the Ministerial majority will be to reform the Senate, for Spain, not less than France and England, finds the institution of a second Chamber by no means an unmixed boon.

The German general election, like everything else in Germany, turns upon Prince Bismarck. The late Parliament, elected in 1878, has by

no means proved a docile instrument in his hands. It was kept in order by chronic threats of resignation, and at the close it mutilated the Assurance Bill, on which the Chancellor had set his heart. Grave doubts are entertained by well-informed Germans as to the issue of the pending appeal to the constituencies. Prince Bismarck, apparently despairing, not without cause, of success in the arduous enterprise of winning the artisans from the socialist ranks, has told the farmers of Lower Franconia that "the accomplishment of our common economical programme depends mainly on the support which it receives from the agricultural population," and he appeals to them to combine with other productive trades to return only such deputies as are resolved "to protect and advance German labour and German production, and to assist them by reducing the direct taxes and communal burdens." To protect the producer at the cost of the consumer, to reduce direct taxation by increasing indirect imposts, and to lessen rates at the expense of taxes would form a more attractive programme if Germany was flourishing under the protection vouchsafed to it. But when nations have once embarked on the wrong course they are much more willing to believe that they suffer because they do not sin enough, rather than that the first step towards recovery is to cease to sin at all.

The Socialist party in Germany, which is exceedingly powerful, well organized, and disciplined, professes to be sanguine of success, unless the powers exercised under the modified state of siege are strained so far as to render a free vote impossible. In that case the Socialist party will abandon parliamentary opposition in order to betake itself to the more dangerous method of revolutionary conspiracy. If there is a free ballot, the success of Prince Bismarck is by no means assured; but the ballot in Germany is by no means identical with secrecy, and pressure may secure a verdict which might otherwise be withheld. The brilliant success of the Chancellor's foreign policy, never more conspicuous than at the present moment, fails to reconcile the German elector to a domestic policy of arbitrary repression, a fiscal system based upon a retrograde protectionism, and a policy of semi-socialism described as "practical Christianity," but which bears an ominous resemblance to the familiar plan of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Austria, obeying the Bismarckian impulsion, in seeking that extension in the East which will transfer her centre of gravity to Pesth, or perhaps to Belgrade, is at present engaged in two serious controversies as to her position in the Balkan Peninsula. Her claim to be allowed not merely a presidency, but a casting vote in the Mixed Commission of riverain States, who are to be charged with the police of the Danube from Galatz to the Iron Gates, has

been so vigorously resisted by Roumania, that the Mixed Commission itself, and what is still more serious, the International Danubian Commission, may not improbably cease to exist. The Danube, no longer under European control, would tend to become more and more an Austrian river. Austria, *vis-à-vis* with the small Danubian principalities or kingdoms, would have little difficulty in making her will supreme in its regulation of the navigation, and her superior resources would enable her to complete by expenditure the control which her superior power first enabled her to assert. At the same time that the negotiations over the Mixed Commission have broken down, Austria has excited alarm in another quarter. A conference between Austria, Bulgaria, Servia, and Turkey to arrange for the extension of the Austrian railways to the Ægean was suddenly broken off by the withdrawal of the representative of Turkey, who took alarm at the proposed establishment of Austrian railway influence through the distracted province of Macedonia. Austria took the action of Turkey in bad part, her ambassador at Constantinople broke off diplomatic relations with the Porte, and threats are openly heard at Vienna that the railway shall be made to Salonica, if not with the Sultan's consent, then in spite of his prohibition. Thus alike eastward and southward, Austria is endeavouring to command the roads, which by river and rail enable her to have free advent to the sea. It is curious to contrast the passionate denunciation heaped upon Russia's supposed aspiration for a port in the Ægean, with the indifference with which Austrian designs in the same quarter are regarded even by the most zealous promoters of national misunderstandings. Austria appears to have practically achieved the pacific conquest of the Servian principality. Servia is not annexed, and may not be annexed. Prince Milan, they say, is to be a king, like his brother of Roumania, in autumn, but the price of his kingship is virtual vassalage to the Hapsburg. The Servians appear to be reconciling themselves to their fate with a good grace, and secure what compensations they can in the shape of commercial treaties and subsidized railways. In the Bocche di Cattaro, on the borders of the Herzegovina and Montenegro, Austria is threatened with a small but serious difficulty. There the Austrian has not only influence as at Belgrade, but power, and its exercise seems to be as distasteful to the Slav as it was to the Italian. An attempt to enforce the conscription in violation of the arrangements of 1870 has thrown the Bocchese and the Crivosci, who between them are said to be able to put ten thousand mountaineers into the field, into a state of intense excitement, which persistence in the work of subjugation would convert into open revolt.

The other partitioning power, the last which has entered our lists,

and the most cynical of all, is the French Republic. The absorption of Tunis has been completed, and the angry protests of the Porte have been calmly ignored. M. Roustan has been appointed, it would probably be more accurate to say has appointed himself, sole representative of the Bey in all dealings between Tunis and the other Power. The Rubattino railway concession, which was held by the Italians, has been arbitrarily cancelled, and it is expected that the edifice will be crowned by the expulsion of M. Levy from the Enfida estate. If the Bey has not been deposed and a French Governor-General established in his place, it is only because his sovereignty affords a convenient shield for the irresponsible exercise of power, and because his retention enables M. de Hilaire to say that there has been no annexation.

In Tunis, however, there is henceforth only one real authority, and that is M. Roustan. The enterprise of France in Tunis, which in Italy and in England is regarded as being little better than a buccancering expedition, has been crowned by an undisputed success. Italy has been sorely hit, French "prestige" has been vindicated, a new province has been added to the French Republic, and the Khroumirs appear to have vanished into thin air. Yet, although every point has been gained for which France hoped, she has already discovered how idle was the dream that the advance of her frontier would enable her to regard with equanimity foreign intrigues in neighbouring States, or would stifle Arab disaffection within her own borders. In Algeria she has to face a revolt led by Bou-Amema, which hitherto has baffled all her efforts to repress it, and which has necessitated the disarmament of the tribes as a precautionary measure. No sooner had Tunis been absorbed in order to safeguard Algeria, than it became evident that Tripoli had merely taken the place of Tunis as a centre of possible danger and probable disturbance. A menacing note concerning Turkish action in Tripoli has already warned us that the same reasoning which justified the march to the Bardo logically involves the advance of the French eagles to the shores of the Red Sea.

The evil effects of the raid on Tunis continue to make themselves felt along the shores of the Mediterranean. Turkey has dispatched troops to Tripoli as a protection against the next development of the sacred mission of a superior civilisation. The Egyptian army has been raised from 13,000 to 18,000 men, and considerable alarm—by no means conducive to the smooth working of the international control—has been excited at Cairo. In Spain the cheap and easy conquest of Tunis—it only cost £800,000 in cash—is inciting the descendants of the men who expelled the Moors to prosecute claims upon Morocco, a course which may bring them into collision with France, and can hardly fail to involve them in a costly and useless expedition. But the most unfortunate results of the Tunis expedition are to be seen in

the irritation, to use no stronger term, which it has excited in Italy. Italy and France, who share between them the leadership of the Latin race, have been placed at bitter variance, which would probably have culminated in war but for the preponderance of strength on the side of the aggressor. But although Italy could never go to war alone with any chance of success, she can, and it is to be feared she may, nurse her wrath to keep it warm until the day when an alliance with Austria or with Germany affords an opportunity for revenge. The serious riots at Marseilles, which cost so many lives and occasioned such intense excitement throughout the two nations, were only a single but significant flame-jet shooting up from the central fire to testify to the heat which smoulders below. The consequences for Italy will probably be even more disastrous than for France. Italy is suffering from over-taxation and excessive military expenditure. The abject squalor of masses of her population is intensified by the fiscal policy necessitated by her armaments. The pellagra, a ghastly disease induced by insufficient sustenance and poor food, ravages great districts, but still the cry of each successive War Minister is that of the horse leech. More and yet more money must be poured into the ever-gaping void, and even if the events in Tunis do not lead to war, they will inevitably result in more taxes and more pellagra, that grim shadow that ceases not to dog the steps of militarism in Italy.

It is a relief to turn from the bickering of the jealous nations of the Old World to the spectacle which is presented to us across the Atlantic. The Future is there, and as we contemplate the majestic proportions of the Great Western Republic, with its population of fifty millions rapidly swelling to double that total, we feel that here we have the factor that is destined to revolutionise the world. The influence of the United States upon Europe was by no means insignificant even in the first French Revolution, but it was small compared with that which it is exercising to-day, but was as nothing compared with the power which it will wield to-morrow. We feel the subtle but direct influence of America in almost every European State. The most significant sight afforded us this year, although one of the least noticed, is the enormous exodus which goes on unceasingly from the Old World to the New. In numerical proportions the exodus of the Children of Israel to the Promised Land was a mere bagatelle compared with the vast and fertilising stream of human life which is being emptied upon the prairies of the West. The rate of immigration into New York will this year exceed two thousand a day. Altogether the United States have received an overflow of the surplus population of Europe exceeding ten million persons in the last fifty years. Hitherto America has been but as the safety-valve of the older world. The outcasts, the proscribed, the oppressed, and the

hunger-smitten of Europe, have found in the American Republic a safe shelter and a well-spread table. "The Providence that ordains all things," said an American recently, "has bestowed upon America land enough to give every European peasant a farm." It seems now as if every peasant is about to claim his guerdon." The rush across the Atlantic is unprecedented. One-fortieth of the entire population of Sweden has booked passages to New York. "If this goes on unchecked," said a German, "in a few years all Germany will be found in America." Already Ireland beyond the sea counts more sons of Irish descent than the Green Isle itself. Even from little Switzerland last year went seven thousand emigrants to the Republics of the West. More than fifty per cent. of the emigrants are able-bodied men under forty years of age. The emigrants are the cream of the population of the countries which they desert. The "feckless loon" stays at home. It is the man of intelligence, enterprise, and energy, who emigrates. It is obvious that so vast a disturbance of the balance of population must in the long run produce corresponding changes in the political and economical situation. The reflex action of the New World upon the Old, already great, is daily increasing. Everywhere American competition, American emigration, or American ideas are at work disintegrating the fabric of European society, and perplexing the statesmen of the older world with thoughts of change. The constant drain of his best fighting men to the New World is one of the greatest grievances which Prince Bismarck cherishes against Providence, and his perplexity is more or less shared by the masters of many legions all over Europe. In Ireland we are face to face with a movement which owes its origin to the Irish Americans, who supply it with its organ, its funds, and its leaders. The same phenomenon may yet be witnessed in Germany. It is already being witnessed in the latest agitation against Austrian rule in the Bocche di Cattaro, where the mountaineers are said to be incited to revolt by returned emigrants from America, who have brought with them the democratic ideas of the West. American influence moulded the Bulgarian constitution, and although that has proved no great success, being too much in advance of the condition of the population, it is a significant hint of things which are to come. So far from allowing the Europeans who are settling in millions within their borders to Europeanise the States, the States bid fair to Americanise Europe.

American influence is most directly felt in the economical region, but the political effects of the economic revolution which is being wrought by American competition are already becoming perceptible. The American farmer is undermining the foundations of the English aristocratic system. While driving his plough through the virgin prairie, he is uprooting the feudal institutions which linger beyond their time in the older world.



THE
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

— — — — —
No. CLXXVI. NEW SERIES.—August 1, 1881.
— — — — —

IRISH GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

IN 1796, the year before his death, when the political prospect for the people of Ireland seemed desperate, and all political struggle on their part useless and impotent, Burke wrote to an Irishman as follows :—

“I should recommend to the middle ranks, in which I include not only all merchants, but all farmers and tradesmen, that they would change as much as possible those expensivè modes of living and that dissipation to which our countrymen in general are so much addicted. It does not at all become men in a state of persecution. They ought to conform themselves to the circumstances of a people whom Government is resolved not to consider as upon a par with their fellow-subjects. Favour they will have none. They must aim at other resources, and to make themselves independent *in fact* before they aim at a *nominal* independence. Depend upon it, that with half the privileges of the others, joined to a different system of manners, they would grow to a degree of importance to which, without it, no privileges could raise them, much less any intrigues or factious practices. I know very well that such a discipline, among so numerous a people, is not easily introduced, but I am sure it is not impossible. If I had youth and strength, I would go myself over to Ireland to work on that plan; so certain I am that the well-being of all descriptions in the kingdom, as well as of themselves, depends upon a reformation amongst the Catholics. The work will be sure and slow in its operation, but it is certain in its effect. There is nothing which will not yield to perseverance and method.”

Whether a sumptuary reform in the habits of the middle classes in Ireland is a crying need of the present hour, I will not judge. If it is, it is not a reform which we can well isolate from other needs, and pursue by itself alone and directly. It is a reform which must depend upon enlarging the minds and raising the aims of those classes; upon humanising and civilising them. Expense in living, dissipation, are the first and nearest dangers, perhaps, to the Irish middle class, while its civilisation is low, because they are its first and nearest pleasures. They can only cease to be its first and nearest pleasures by raising its standard of life, by extending and deepening its civilisation. True, the improvement of Ireland, the self-government of Ireland, must come mainly through the middle class, and this class, defective in civili-

sation as it is, is not ripe for the functions required of it; its members have indeed to learn, as Burke says, "to make themselves independent *in fact* before they aim at a *nominal* independence." Not Ireland alone needs, alas, the lesson; we in England need it too. In England, too, power is passing away from the now governing class; the part to be taken in English life by the middle class is different from the part which the middle class has had to take hitherto—different, more public, more important. Other and greater functions devolve upon this class than of old; but its defective civilisation makes it unfit to discharge them. It comes to the new time and to its new duties, it comes to them, as its flatterers will never tell it, but as it must nevertheless bear to be told and well to consider—it comes to them with a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners. The characters of defective civilisation in the Irish middle class are not precisely the same as in the English. But for the faults of the middle class in Ireland, as in England, the same remedy presents itself to start with; not a panacea by any means, not all-sufficient, not capable of working miracles of change in a moment, but yet a remedy sure to do good; the first and simplest and most natural remedy to apply, although it is left singularly out of sight and thought and mention. The middle class in England and Ireland is the worst schooled middle class in Western Europe. Surely this may well have something to do with defects of civilisation! Surely it must make a difference to the civilisation of a middle class, whether it is brought up in ignoble schools where the instruction is nearly worthless, or in schools of high standing where the boy is taken through a well-chosen course of the best that has been known and said in the world. I, at any rate, have long been of opinion that the most beneficent reform possible in England at present is a reform about which hardly anybody seems to think or care—the establishment of good public schools for the middle classes. Most salutary for Ireland also would be the establishment of such schools there. In what state is the actual supply of schools for the middle classes in Ireland, we learn from a report lately published by a very competent observer, Professor Mahaffy, of Trinity College, Dublin. I propose to give here a short account of what he tells us, and to add a few thoughts which suggest themselves after reading him.

Professor Mahaffy was appointed by the Endowed Schools Commission in 1879 to visit and report upon the Grammar Schools of Ireland. He inspected the buildings and accommodations, attended the classes, examined the pupils; and he also visited some of the principal Grammar Schools in England, such as Winchester, Marlborough, Uppingham, and the City of London School, to provide himself with a definite standard of comparison. Professor Mahaffy

is a man, as is well known, of brilliant attainments ; he has had, also, great practical experience in teaching, and he writes with a freshness, plainness, and point which make his report very easy and agreeable reading.

The secondary schools of Ireland are classified by Professor Mahaffy as follows : the Royal Schools, the lesser schools managed by the Commissioners of Education, the Erasmus Smith's schools, the Incorporated Society's schools, the Protestant diocesan schools, the schools with private endowments, the Roman Catholic colleges, and the unendowed schools. He visited schools of each class. In all, or almost all, of them he found the instruction profoundly affected by the rules of the Intermediate Schools Commissioners. His report is full of remarks on the evil working of the examinations of this Intermediate Board, and he appears to consider the most important part of his business as reporter to be the delivering of his testimony against them. The Board arose, as is well known, out of the desire to do something for intermediate education in Ireland without encountering what is called the religious difficulty. "The Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment ; the Protestants of Great Britain are emphatically hostile to the endowment of Catholicism in any shape or form." Schools were not to be founded or directly aided, because this might be an endowment of Catholicism ; but a system of examinations and prizes was established, whereby Catholic schools may be indeed aided indirectly, but so indirectly, it seems, as to suffer the consciences of the Protestants of Great Britain to remain at peace. Only this system of examinations and prizes, while good for the consciences of the Protestants of Great Britain, is very bad, in Professor Mahaffy's opinion, for the Irish schools. He insists on its evil effects in the very first page of his report, in speaking of the Royal School of Armagh, the chief of the Royal Schools, and the school with which he begins. He says :—

"Under the rules of the Intermediate Commissioners it is found more advantageous to answer in a number of unimportant subjects of which a hastily learned smattering suffices, than to study with earnestness the great subjects of education—classics and mathematics. Hence, boys spend every leisure moment, and even part of their proper school time, in learning little text-books on natural science, music, and even Irish, to the detriment of their solid progress. This is not all. Owing to the appointing of fixed texts in classics and the paucity of new passages in the examination, the boys are merely crammed in the appointed texts without being taught real scholarship. When examining a senior division in classics, I observed that they all brought up annotated texts, in fact so fully annotated that every second clause was translated for them ; and upon observing this to the master, he replied that he knew the evil, but that he could not get them through the intermediate course in any other way."

All through the report this is Professor Mahaffy's great and ever-recurring complaint : "the multiplication of subjects supported by

the Intermediate Board, which suit inaccurate and ill-taught pupils far better than those who learn the great subjects thoroughly." Everywhere it struck him that "the boys, even when not over-worked, were addled with a quantity of subjects. They are taught a great many valuable truths; but they have not assimilated them, and only answer by accident. I have found this mental condition all over the country." He calls the intermediate examinations "the lowest and poorest of all public competitions." The more intelligent of the schoolmasters, he says, condemn them:—

"The principal (of the French college at Blackrock) has very large and independent views about education, which are well worthy of serious attention. He complains bitterly of the low standard of the prize and scholarship examinations at the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway, boys having obtained *distinctions* there, whom he had resolved to send home to their parents on account of their stolid and invincible ignorance. He objects altogether to the intermediate examinations, and says that his profession is ruined by the complete subjugation of all school work to the fixed programme, which is quite insufficient to occupy the better boys for a year, and which thus seriously impairs their progress. He also protests against the variety of unimportant subjects which produce fees for results, and thinks that a minimum of at least thirty-five per cent. should be struck off the answering if these subjects are retained."

However, "the false stimulus now supplied in the system of intermediate examinations established by Government" is too strong to be resisted:—

"So strong a mercenary spirit has been excited both in masters and parents by this system, that all the schools in Ireland with one exception (the Friends' School in Waterford) have been forced into the competition; every boy is being taught the intermediate course, every error in the management of that course is affecting the whole country, and the best educator is unable to stem the tide, or do more than protest against any of the defects."

Professor Mahaffy is a hearty admirer of the great English public schools. He is of opinion "that what distinguishes the Englishman all over the world above men of equal breeding and fortune in other nations is the training of those peculiar commonwealths, in which boys form a sort of constitution, and govern themselves under the direction of a higher authority." But he thinks that the over-use of prize competitions and examinations is doing harm in the great English schools too, though they are not enslaved by it as the Irish schools are:—

"I find that by the spirit of the age and the various requirements of many competitions, both English and Irish Schools have been driven into the great vice of multiplying subjects of instruction, and so crowding together hours of diverse teaching that the worst results must inevitably ensue. There is, in the first place, that enervating mental fatigue and consequent ill-health which is beginning to attract attention. When I visited Winchester it was easy to distinguish in a large class the boys who had won their way into the foundation by competition; they were remarkable for their worn and unhealthy looks.

This evil, however, the evil of over-work at examination courses, has already excited public attention, and is, I trust, in a fair way of being remedied. Nor did it strike me as at all so frequent in Irish schools as another mischief arising from the same cause. It rather appeared to me all over Ireland, and England also, that the majority of boys, without being over-worked, were *addled by the multiplicity* of their subjects, and instead of increasing their knowledge had utterly confused it. Whenever I asked the masters to point me out a brilliant boy they replied that the race had died out. Is it conceivable that this arises from any inherent failing of the stock, and not rather from some great blundering in the system of our education? The great majority of thoughtful educators with whom I conferred agreed that it was due to this constant addition of new subjects—to the cry after English grammar and English literature, and French and German, and natural science, to the subdivision of the wretched boys' time into two hours in the week for this, two hours for that, alternate days for this, alternate days for that—in fact, to an injurious system of so teaching him everything that he can reason intelligently in nothing. I cannot speak too strongly of the melancholy impression forced upon me by the examination of many hundred boys in various schools through England and Ireland. I sought in vain for bright promise, for quick intelligence, for keen sympathy with their studies. It was not, I am sure, the boys' fault nor the masters'. It is the result of the present bon-constrictor system of competitive examination which is strangling our youth in its fatal embrace."

Professor Mahaffy finds fault with the Irish secondary schools as too often dirty and untidy, and ill-provided with proper accommodations. "Whitewashing, painting, and scouring of floors are urgently needed; indeed an additional supply of soap to the boys would not come amiss." He notices the Jesuit College of St. Stanislaus, and a school at Portarlington, as signal exceptions. In general "the floors are so filthy as to give a grimy and disgusting appearance to the whole room; people are so accustomed to this in all Irish schools that they wonder at my remarking it." At the chief of the Erasmus Smith's Schools, the high school in Dublin, "I was detained," he tells us, "some time at the door, owing to the deafness of the porter, and thus having ample leisure to inspect the front of the house, found that the exceeding dirt of the windows made it pre-eminent, even among its shabbiest neighbours. I learned, on inquiry, that most of the window sashes are not movable. It is surprising that the members of the Board are not offended by this aspect of squalor and decay. I found the playground a mass of mud, which was carried on the boys' boots all through the stairs and schoolrooms, thus making the inside of the house correspond with the outside." He finds fault with the "wretched system of management" which prevails in the Endowed Schools, a system which prevents needful reforms, and perpetuates inefficient arrangements and incompetent teachers, "old and wearied men." Those who elect the master, he says of the Clonmel School, "are two absent lords, and I suppose a more unlikely Board to select a good schoolmaster could not easily be found. In the present case a rule has been followed the very opposite of that which prevails in England.

There a schoolmaster retires upon a living; here a clergyman has retired from a living upon a school." In another school, where the head-master is well qualified, Professor Mahaffy finds the assistant-master stopping the way:—

"But when we come to the assistant-master we find things in a deplorable condition. He holds his place by appointment of the patron, and is not removable by the head-master or Commissioners, or perhaps by any one. The present usher is a man of about eighty or ninety years of age, indeed he may possibly be one hundred; he is so dull and shrivelled with age that he only comes in late, and is unable to teach anything. I do not think he comprehended who I was or what I wanted. His appointment dates from the remote past, and when I asked what his qualifications were or had once been, I could learn nothing but some vague legends about his great severity in early youth; in fact, I was told *he had once pulled the ear off a boy*. But these were venerable traditions."

Finally, Professor Mahaffy finds fault with that which is our signal deficiency in England also, the want of all general organisation of the service of secondary instruction, of all co-ordination of the existing resources scattered over the country:—

"The general impression produced by a survey of the Irish Grammar Schools is this, that while there are many earnest and able men engaged in teaching and in improving the condition of education, all these efforts are individual efforts or scattered efforts, and the results produced are vastly inferior to those which might be expected from the existing national endowments both of money and of talent. For the Irish nation, with all its patent faults, is a clever nation; Irish boys are above the average in smartness and versatility; if the system of education were at all perfect, great intellectual results might fairly be expected."

Still the tyranny of the intermediate course, and the bad effects it is producing on the Irish schools, are so completely the governing idea in our reporter's mind, that after enumerating all other hindrances to secondary instruction in Ireland, he cannot but return to this chief hindrance and conclude with it. He laments that the better endowed schools, at any rate, were not excluded by the Act from competing, and from ruining their school-course accordingly:—

"For my own part I feel constrained to recommend schools in England or elsewhere, where this enslaving system has not penetrated. It may no doubt act as a great stimulus to bad schools, and to a low type of scholars, who had otherwise been subject to no test whatever. To all higher schools, and to the higher class of boys who desire and deserve a real education in literature and science, this competition is an almost unmitigated evil. To the real schoolmaster, who desires to develop the nature of his boys after his own fashion and by his own methods, such a system is a death-blow. The day will yet come when men will look back on the mania in our legislation for competition as the anxious blundering of honest reformers who tried to cure the occasional abuses of favouritism by substituting universal hardships, and to raise the tone of lower education by levelling down the higher, by substituting diversity for depth, and by destroying all that freedom and leisure in learning which are the true conditions of solid and lasting culture."

Professor Mahaffy admires, as I have said, public schools in

England, and envies us them. "The English public school," he says, "remains and will remain a kind of training place to which no nation in Europe, not to say the Irish, can show a parallel." I agree with him in admiring our great public schools; still the capital failure of Ireland in regard to secondary instruction is exhibited by us also. We have good schools in England, expensive but good, for the boys of the aristocratic and landed class, and of the higher professional classes, and for the sons of wealthy merchants and manufacturers. But it is not difficult to provide good schools for people who can and will, in considerable numbers, pay highly for them. Irish parents who belong to the aristocratic and landed class, or to the higher professional classes, or to the class of wealthy merchants and manufacturers, can and do send their sons to our English public schools, and get them well trained and taught there. Professor Mahaffy approves of their doing so. "It is not the least surprising that Irish parents who can afford it should choose this system for the education of their boys. No foolish talk about patriotism, no idle rant about absenteeism, can turn any conscientious parent from studying, above all, his children's welfare, and if he visits the great public schools of England he will certainly be impressed with their enormous advantages." I cannot myself see any disadvantage, or anything but advantage, to an Irish boy in being trained at one of the English public schools, and if the whole middle class in Ireland could afford to use these schools I should not bemoan their condition, or busy myself about reforming the state of secondary instruction amongst them. But they cannot. The bulk of the middle class in Ireland cannot, and the bulk of the middle class in England cannot either; the real weak point in the secondary instruction of both countries is the same. M. Gambetta is the son, I am told, of a tradesman at Cahors, and he was brought up in the *lycée* of Cahors, a school not so delightful and historic as Eton, certainly, but with a status as honourable as that of Eton, and with a teaching as good. In what kind of schools are the sons of tradesmen in England and Ireland brought up? They are brought up in the worst and most ignoble secondary schools in Western Europe. Ireland has nothing to envy us here. For the great bulk of our middle class, as well as for the great bulk of hers, the school provision is wholly inadequate.

It can only become adequate by being treated as a public service, as a service for which the State, the nation in its collective and corporate character, is responsible. This proposition I have often advanced and sufficiently expounded; to me its truth seems self-evident, and the practice of other countries is present, besides, to speak for it. I am not going to enlarge upon this theme now. I want rather to point out how it comes to pass that in England and

Ireland the truth is not accepted and acted upon, and what difference there is, in this respect, between the case of England and that of Ireland.

In England secondary instruction is not a public service, popular politicians and speakers at public meetings would tell us, because of the individual energy and self-reliance of the Englishman, and his dislike of State interference. No doubt there is in the Englishman a repugnance to being meddled with, a desire to be let alone; no doubt he likes to act individually whenever he can, and not to have recourse to action of a collective and corporate character. To make even popular education a public service was very difficult; it is only a few years since one might hear State-aided elementary schools described as schools with the *State-taint* upon them. However, the expediency and necessity of making popular education a public service grew to appear so manifest, that the repugnance was overcome, and, so far as popular education is concerned, the reproach of *State-taint* has disappeared from people's mouths and minds. Now, to make middle-class education a public service is only less expedient and necessary than to make popular education a public service; but, as to popular education, the light has dawned upon the community here in England, as to middle-class education it has not. To talk of the *State-taint* in this case is still popular; and a prominent member of the governing class, such as Lord Frederick Cavendish, will go and extol a middle-class audience, composed of people with a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners—he will positively go and extol them for their energy and self-reliance in not adopting the means most naturally and directly fitted to lift them out of this imperfect state of civilisation, and will win their delighted applause by doing so. This is a phenomenon of our social politics which receives its explanation, as I have often said, only when we consider that the upper class amongst us does not wish to be disturbed in its preponderance, or the middle class in its vulgarity. Not that Lord Frederick Cavendish does not speak in perfect good faith; he takes as a general rule the native English conviction that to act individually is a fine thing, and thinks that he cannot be wrong in applying it in any novel case that may arise. Still, at the bottom of the mind of our governing class is an instinct, on this matter of education, telling it that a really good and public education of the middle class is the surest means of removing in the end those inferiorities which at present make our middle class impossible as a governing class, and our upper class indispensable;—and this consummation it is not every one in a governing class that can desire, though every one ought to desire it. That the middle class should seek not to be disturbed in its

vulgarity may seem more strange. But here, too, is at bottom the native English instinct for following one's individual course, for not being meddled with. Then, also, what most strongly moves and attaches, or has most strongly moved and attached hitherto, the strongest part of our middle class, the Puritan part, is the type of religion to which their nature and circumstances have since the Reformation led them; and to this type of religion the State, the nation acting as a whole in its collective and corporate character, has in general not been favourable. They are apprehensive, then, that to their religion a training in the schools of the State might not be favourable; as indeed to the whole narrow system of life—now become a second nature to them and much endeared to their hearts—arising out of the peculiar conjunction of the second great interest of their lives, business, with the first great interest of their lives, religion; they are apprehensive that the wider ideas and larger habits of public schools might not be favourable. And so they are on their part as little forward to make middle-class education a public service as the governing class, on their part, are little forward to do so; and although the necessities of the future, and the pressing sense of the defects of its actual civilisation, will in the end force the middle class to change its line, and to demand what it now shrinks from, yet this has not happened yet, and perhaps may not happen for some years to come.

If, therefore, secondary instruction remains in a very faulty and incoherent state in England, at least it is by our own doing that it remains so. The governing class is not seriously concerned to make it adequate and coherent; it is, on the contrary, indisposed to do so. It will do what the middle class, the class on whose favour political power depends, it will do what this class demands, but it will do no more. The middle class, again, the class immediately concerned, has not yet acquired sufficient lucidity of mind to demand public schools, and to demand the resolute investigation and appliance of the best means for making them good. It has no such simple and logical aims governing its mind in this matter. A coherent system of public middle-class schools it does not at present want at all. Aims of quite another sort govern it, whenever anything has to be done in regard to education; its Protestant feelings must be respected, openings must be provided as far as possible for its children, and whatever is done must be plausible. And the governing class will always take good care to meet its wishes. Professor Mahaffy will find that the things which so disturb his peace as a lover of education are all due to this cause: that the English middle class has aims quite other than the direct aim of making education efficient, and that the governing class, in whatever it does, respects them. He complains of the Intermediate Board and its system of prizes and

examinations ; but what would he have ? Something had to be done for Irish secondary instruction, but the English public was by no means simply bent on doing what was best for this ; alas, it is not even bent on doing what is best for its own ! Something had to be done in Ireland for secondary instruction, but the Protestant feelings of the public of Great Britain must before all things be respected. "The Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment ; the Protestants of Great Britain are implacably hostile to the endowment of Catholicism in any shape or form." And the Government paid all due respect to those Protestant feelings ; hence the Intermediate Board. The whole system of perpetual competitive examinations everywhere, which Professor Mahaffy thinks so fatal, and which he attributes to the anxious blundering of honest reformers trying to cure the occasional abuses of favouritism, is he right in so attributing it ? Surely not ; there was no such blundering as he speaks of, because there was no desire to discover and do what was positively best in the matter. But the great British middle-class public had a desire to procure as many openings as possible for its children, and the Government could gratify this desire, and also relieve itself of responsibility ; hence our competitive examinations. The composition of the Boards and Commissions for Education, again, on which so much depends when studies have to be organised and programmes laid down, Professor Mahaffy is dissatisfied with them. He wants, he says, "one responsible body, not made up altogether of lords and bishops and judges, who give their spare moments to such duties, but mainly of practical educators. No one is so likely to be led away by novelties as the elderly amateur in education, who knows nothing of its practical working, and legislates on specious theories. So long as Boards in Ireland are chiefly made up of people of social or political importance only, education will not prosper." But does Professor Mahaffy imagine that the British public has a fancy for a lucid and logical-minded Board, simply bent on perfecting education ? Not at all ; it wants a Board that is plausible, and the Government, when it institutes a Board, at least does its best to make a plausible one. Hence the "lords and bishops and judges ;" hence "the elderly amateur." Professor Mahaffy anticipates that "the new Irish University will probably be arranged like the intermediate system," and not as a lover of education would desire. On that point I will give no opinion ; all I am sure of is that it will be arranged plausibly. That is what our middle-class public want, and the Government will certainly accomplish it.

No, the great English middle-class public is at present by no means set seriously on making education efficient all round ; it prefers its routine and its claptrap to even its own education. It is

and must be free to do so if it likes. We who lament its doing so, who see what it loses by doing so, can only resolve not to be dupes of its claptrap ourselves, and not to help in duping others with it, but to work with patience and perseverance for the evocation of that better spirit which will surely rise in this great class at last.

Meanwhile, however, it sacrifices to its routine and claptrap not only its own education, but the education of the Irish middle class also; and this is certainly hard. It is hard, that is, if the Irish middle class is not of one mind with it in the matter, does not share in its routine and claptrap, and prefer them to its education. I suppose no one will dispute that the type of secondary instruction in the Intermediate Board, the type of superior instruction in the new Irish University, is determined by that maxim regnant, as we are told, in the middle-class electorate of Great Britain: "The Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment; the Protestants of Great Britain are emphatically hostile to the endowment of Catholicism in any shape or form." And this when we have in Britain Oxford and Cambridge, and Eton and Winchester, and the Scotch universities! And one of the organs of the British Philistine expresses astonishment at my thinking it worth while at the present day to collect Burke's Irish writings, says that the state of things which Burke had to deal with is now utterly gone, that he had to deal with Protestant ascendancy, and that "the Catholics have now not a single complaint." As if the Intermediate Board, as if the new Irish University, determined in the manner they are, and from the motives they are, were not in themselves evidences of the continued reign of Protestant ascendancy!

But not only has Ireland a just claim not to have her education determined by the "Protestant feelings" of Great Britain, she has a just claim not to have it determined by other feelings, also, of our British public which go to determine it now. She has a just claim, in short, to have it determined as she herself likes. It is a plea for Home Rule if the way of dealing with education, and with other like things, which satisfies our Murdstones and Quinions, but does not satisfy people of quicker minds, is imposed on these people when they desire something better, because it is the way which the Murdstones and Quinions know and like. The Murdstones and Quinions, with their strong individuality and their peculiar habits of life, do not want things instituted by the State, by the nation acting in its collective and corporate character; they do not want State schools, or State festivals, or State theatres; they prefer their Salem House and their music-hall, and to be congratulated by Lord Frederick Cavendish upon their energy and self-reliance. And this is all very well for the Murdstones and Quinions, since they like to have it so; but it is hard that they should insist on the Irishman too acting as if

he had the same peculiar taste, if he have not. With other nations the idea of the State, of the nation in its collective and corporate character, instituting means for developing and dignifying the national life, has great power; and such a disposition of mind is more congenial, perhaps, to the Irish people, than the disposition of mind of our middle class in Great Britain. The executive Government in Ireland is a very different thing from the executive Government in England, and has a much more stringent operation; but not in this sense of giving effect to aspirations of the national life for developing and raising itself. The Castle is rather a bureau of management for governing the country in compliance as far as possible with English ideas.

If the Irish desire to make the State do otherwise in Ireland than it does in England, if they wish their middle-class education, for instance, to be a public service with the organisation and guarantees of a public service, they may fairly claim to have these wishes listened to; and listened to, if they are clearly formed, rationally conceived, and steadily persisted in, such wishes ultimately must be. It would be too monstrous that Ireland should be refused an advantage which she desires, and which all our civilised neighbours on the Continent find indispensable, because the middle class in England does not care to claim for itself the advantage in question. The great thing is for the Irish to make up their minds clearly on the matter. Do they earnestly desire to make their middle-class education adequate and efficient, to leave it no longer dependent on "individual efforts, scattered efforts," to rescue it from its dirt and dilapidation, and from such functionaries as its aged assistant *who once pulled the ear off a boy*? Then let them make it a public service. Does Professor Mahaffy wish to relieve Irish boys from the unintelligent tyranny of endless examinations and competitions, and from being "stupefied by a multiplicity of subjects"? Let him, then, get his countrymen to demand that their secondary instruction shall be made a public service, with the honest, logical, single-minded aim of efficiency. Then these questions as to studies, competitions, and examinations will come, as with us at present, whether in England or in Ireland, they never come, under responsible review by a competent mind: and this is what is wanted. The personages of high social standing, the "lords and bishops and judges," the "elderly amateur" of whom Professor Mahaffy complains, will cease to potter, and we shall have, instead, the responsible review of a competent mind. Ireland will not only be doing good to herself by making such a demand; she will also be teaching England and the English middle class how to live.

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

A NEW LIFE OF VOLTAIRE.¹

THREE years ago, on the occasion of the Voltaire and Rousseau centenary, I had the honour of writing something about it in these pages. Shortly after the appearance of the article, I met a young lady—an old pupil of mine—who saluted me with the reproachful greeting: “I see you have been praising that wretch Voltaire. How could you do it?” Although I was fully aware that considerable numbers of presumably sane human beings still thought and spoke of Voltaire as a wretch, I confess I was a little startled to find that among them were persons of intelligence and cultivation, as this lady certainly was. The astonishment was perhaps unphilosophical, for prejudice in general and ignorance in particular will account for most things. But the general prejudice against Voltaire has certainly not died out, and it may be doubted whether knowledge as to what he actually said, wrote, and thought is as yet very widely spread in England. It is certainly not necessary to say to readers of the *Fortnightly Review* that we have in English admirable works of the biographical essay kind on Voltaire of much more recent date than Mr. Carlyle’s famous and still indispensable study; but no work of the compass of those alluded to can possibly do more than summarise the events and comment on the productions of a life so long and so busy as Voltaire’s. The sort of book that is now wanted is a book that shall contain in full measure and orderly arrangement the *pièces*—the supporting documents and facts of Mr. Carlyle’s and our Editor’s conclusions, and of such conclusions as may be formed by a reader who likes to create for himself, and who yet does not care to work through the hundred volumes supplemented by all the biographies from Duvernet to Desnoires-terres, and all the criticisms from Folard to Martin. This is what Mr. Parton has attempted to supply. I do not purpose in this place to examine very minutely into the manner in which he has performed his task; though I must say briefly that it is not well performed. The author, I believe, is an American journalist of some position, and a recent article of his on American politics has excited a good deal of attention on both sides of the Atlantic. He writes fairly well, and seems to have taken a great deal of trouble with his work; but he does not appear to possess anything like the width of literary culture which is the necessary equipment of any one who writes on Voltaire. He makes a good many grotesque blunders, and his critical powers seem to me altogether defective.

(1) *Life of Voltaire*. By James Parton. London: Sampson Low & Co., 1881.

But he has got together a very great deal of information about his hero from a very large number of different sources, and his book, with the exception of the eight volumes of Desnoiresterres, gives probably the most extensive and the fullest store of information on the subject to be found between the covers of any single work. I shall, therefore, in this article busy myself very little with Mr. Parton, and almost entirely with the portrait of Voltaire's life and works which Mr. Parton has got together.

The knowledge of the general English public as to Voltaire may be said to begin with his second Bastille experience, his exile to England, and the *Henriade*. Before that time his Jesuit education, the Ninon legacy, and perhaps the love affair in Holland, almost sum up the list of events in his life which have held their ground with most of us. Mr. Parton has filled up this somewhat scanty outline with plenty of interesting detail. His indications of the society and atmosphere in which the future patriarch acquired or developed the peculiarities which afterwards distinguished him are sufficiently full. The home with the solid and business-like father, the Jansenist elder brother, the mother of whom so little is known, but whose attraction for the men of letters and wits of the period had so much to do with her son's future career, can be sufficiently realised from his pages. An exposition of the profound ethnicism which resulted by way of development almost equally from the Cartesian philosophy and the Gassendian, by way of reaction from the iron formality on religious matters of the Court of Louis XIV. in its later days, requires indeed a greater knowledge of French seventeenth century literature to explain it than Mr. Parton seems to possess. But if he does not know much of St. Evremond and the early *philosophes*, he knows something of the Abbé de Chateauneuf and the Abbé de Chaulieu, of Dangeau and St. Simon, and duly sets it before his readers. To the company of abbés and fine gentlemen, to whom a *Moïsade* was the greatest of delights, if only because it was a forbidden luxury, something at least of the attitude of Voltaire towards matters religious may fairly be traced. His apparently contradictory attitude in politics may, with equal fairness, be assigned in part—all such assignments are delusive if they pretend to explain the whole—to the company of his childhood at the Collège Louis le Grand, where the sons of the greatest men of the kingdom underwent the equal justice of Jesuit corporal punishment in common with Voltaire and other *cuisîtres*, as the elegant phrase of the day would have put it. Voltaire himself was never exactly a parasite, but, like a man of greater if less varied genius—Swift—he very early mastered the truth that an ingenious mixture of flattery and independence was more efficient for the purpose of making his way than flattery pure and simple, and that

independence pure and simple was certain to bar the way to success of any kind. The anecdotes of his youth, it is well known, are for the most part derived from his own authority, an authority which, as to plain matters of fact, is deservedly regarded with a certain suspicion even by very well-affectioned critics. From these anecdotes, however, and from the ascertained facts which accompany them, a very fair picture can be made out of the boy who in this case was unquestionably father to the man. His liking for good society and the liking of good society for him, his fertility of composition and conversation, his generally amiable character, joined as it was to a faculty of playing "monkey-tricks," which recalls Pope much more than Swift, already appear. In these early days he was somewhat extravagant; indeed it would not be correct to say that he was ever parsimonious. But he had, like Scott, and presumably like Shakespeare, a deep conviction that independence in matter of money was indispensable to independence in matter of speech and writing, and he had inherited from his father a business capacity of a very remarkable kind. In later days speculation was to Voltaire what sport pure and simple is to some people, and art pure and simple to others—an employment which had an irresistible attraction from the mere fact of his own proficiency in the game. At this time, however, he was unsophisticated, and capable enough of extravagance of the most whimsical kind. Nothing more whimsical, perhaps, is recorded of him than the following anecdote:—

"There is an anecdote, also, of a great lady giving him a hundred louis for correcting her verses, and of the use he made of the money, which may have some basis of truth. Going along the street, overjoyed to find himself the possessor of so large a sum, he came to where an auctioneer was selling a carriage, a pair of horses, and the liveries of a coachman and footman. He bid a hundred louis for the lot, and it was knocked down to him. All day he drove about Paris, giving his friends rides, supped gaily in the city, and continued to ride till late in the evening, when, not knowing what else to do with them, he crowded the horses into his father's stable, already full. The thundering noise of this operation woke the old man, who, on learning its cause, turned young scapegrace out of doors, and, the next day, had the carriage and horses sold for half price."

These and other freaks may very well have determined his father, as a kind of compromise between his own desire that Voltaire should settle down to a recognised profession and the young man's craving for literature, to send him into Holland as *attaché* to the Marquis de Chateauneuf. But if Voltaire had previously shown himself young in matter of money—it appears that he considerably "dipped" the Ninon legacy, and continued to regard that windfall as more convenient for the floating of bills than for the purchasing of books—he now showed that he was a very natural and unprecocious person in another way. The affair with Olympe Dunoyer would be a pathetic but commonplace piece of calf-love if it were not for the extraordi-

nary fertility of brain which the young man showed in fighting against the obstacles which were thrown in the path of true affection. Mr. Parton has not shown, and, indeed, no biographer has shown, how it was that an adventuress, as Pimpette's mother undoubtedly was if Pimpette was not, could for a moment have supposed him to be an eligible match, considering his insignificant rank, his want not merely of money but of any great prospect of money, and his extreme youth. That he was sincerely and honestly in love with the young lady—it is needless to say that she was two or three years his senior—there can be no doubt. Here is a letter and an incident of the courtship:—

“ ‘ Send me three letters,’ he wrote, ‘ one for your father, one for your uncle, and one for your sister ; that is absolutely necessary ; but I shall only deliver them when circumstances favour, especially the one for your sister. Let the shoemaker be the bearer of those letters ; promise him a reward ; and let him come with a last in his hand, as if to mend my shoes. Add to those letters a note for me ; let me have that comfort on setting out ; and, above all, in the name of the love I bear you, my dear, send me your portrait ; use all your efforts to get it from your mother ; it had better be in my hands than in hers, for it is already in my heart. The servant I send you is wholly devoted to me, and if you wish to pass him off to your mother as a snuff-box maker, he is a Norman and will play the part well. . . . I shall do all that is possible to see you to-morrow before leaving Holland ; but, as I cannot assure you of it, I bid you good-bye, my dear heart, for the last time, and I do it swearing to you all the tender love which you merit. Yes, my dear Pimpette, I shall love you always. Lovers the least faithful say the same ; but their love is not founded, as mine is, upon perfect esteem. I love your goodness as much as I love your person, and I only ask of Heaven the privilege of imbibing from you the noble sentiments you possess. . . . Adieu once more, my dear mistress ; think a little of your unhappy lover, but not so as to dash your spirits. Keep your health if you wish to preserve mine. Above all, have a great deal of discretion ; burn my letter and all that you get from me ; it were better to be less generous to me and take better care of yourself. Let us take comfort from the hope of seeing one another very soon, and let us love one another as long as we live. Perhaps I shall even come back here in quest of you, and, if so, I shall be the happiest of men. But, after all, provided you get to Paris, I shall be only too well satisfied ; for, wishing only your welfare, I would willingly secure it at the expense of my own, and should feel myself richly recompensed in cherishing the sweet assurance that I had contributed to restore you to happiness.’ ”

“ So far, so well. This was the letter of an honest lover, and the scheme seemed feasible. But when he summoned Lefèvre to convey the epistle to the young lady, the valet told him he had received orders to deliver to the ambassador any letters his master might charge him with. Away with prudence ! He would see his mistress, despite the vigilance of his chief, one of the most experienced diplomatists in Europe. Favored by an unavoidable delay in setting out, he engaged in a series of manœuvres, precisely such as we laugh at at the theatre, when an imaginary Figaro exerts his talents to help or baffle a fictitious Count. He wrote a letter to Pimpette, which he meant the marquis to read, and told his valet to deliver it to him, as ordered. He corresponded with her continually, and had several interviews with her. One night, at the rising of the moon, he left the embassy in disguise, placed a carriage near the adored one's abode, made the usual comedy signal under her window, received her to his arms, and away they rode, five miles into the country to the sea-side village

of Scheveningen; and there, with the ink and paper which he had provided, she wrote the three letters that he desired for use in Paris. This certainly was the entertainment to which he invited her, and which appears to have been carried out."

Mr. Parton's "appears" seems to me a rather risky expression, but the plan is romantic enough and characteristic enough of the young man's state of mind, even if it was never carried out.

How the cruel father interfered, how Pimpette rapidly consoled herself, and how banishment from Paris awaited Voltaire on his return to France, follows but too certainly. The interval between his return and the production of *Œdipe* is not so well known generally, and the recently published *Sottisier de Voltaire* has, as Mr. Parton says, thrown a good deal of light on it. As soon as he was pardoned, was restored to Paris, and had brought forth nominal fruits of repentance by entering a lawyer's office (where he giggled and made giggle no less than other persons of similar temperament in similar circumstances), he returned also to his favourite pastime of frequenting and occasionally lampooning the great. The following sonnet, which Mr. Parton quotes from the *Sottisier*, is certainly not unworthy of him in style:—

- "Que l'Éternel est grand ! Que sa bonté puissante
A comblé mes désirs, a payé mes travaux ;
Je naquis demoiselle et je devins servante :
Je lavai la vaisselle et frottai les bureaux.
- "J'eus bientôt des amants : je ne fus point ingrate ;
De Villarcaux longtemps j'amusai les transports ;
Il me fit épouser ce fameux cul-de-jatte
Qui vivait de ses vers, comme moi de mon corps.
- "Il mourut. Je fus pauvre, et vieille devenue,
Mes amants, dégoûtés, me laissaient toute nue,
Lorsqu'un tyran me crut propre encore au plaisir.
- "Jo lui plus, il m'aima : jo fis la Madeleine,
Par des refus adroits j'irritai ses désirs ;
Je lui parlai du diable, il eut peur . . . Je suis reine." ¹

Like most literary men in France at all times, Voltaire was inclined to be a *Frondeur*, and his particular patrons happened to be *Frondeurs* also. In the Temple, under the patronage of Vendôme—Mr. Parton gives a fair sketch of this curious Epicurean colony, though he has not made the most of his opportunities—at Sceaux, under the patronage of the Duchess du Maine, he was not indeed exactly an enemy of the Regent's, but at any rate an associate of the Regent's unfriends. He might have written sonnets against Madame de Maintenon to his heart's content had he not been suspected of more dangerous matter. That Mr. Parton is right in exonerating him from the *Puero Regnante* and the *J'ai Vu*—partisan and rather platitudinous libels on the Regent and the Government—

(1) Le Sottisier de Voltaire, Paris, 1880.

there cannot be much doubt. It is certain, however, that he was at this time grossly imprudent, that almost at all times he gave his tongue the rein with some indiscretion, and that he fell into the toils of a Government spy, who either maliciously reported things that were not meant seriously or invented things that were never said. This was the cause of Voltaire's first acquaintance with the Bastille. Despite the better knowledge of French affairs which is now at the disposal of Englishmen, the name of the Bastille still exercises such a power of erroneous impression that it may be worth while to quote a passage from Mr. Parton which is perfectly justified by history. He himself, by subsequently comparing Voltaire's lot with Diderot's, seems not quite to realise the facts of the case. The Bastille was very different from Vincennes, just as Vincennes itself was very different from Mont St. Michel:—

"The king gave his guests an excellent table; nay, a luxurious one. Marmontel's treatment, so amusingly described in his *Memoirs*, was that of many prisoners during the last century of the Bastille's reign. It was cold when Marmontel entered: the valets of the château made him a blazing fire and brought him plenty of wood. He objected to the mattresses; they were changed. A very good Friday dinner was served, with a bottle of tolerable wine, and, after he had eaten it, he was informed that it was meant for his servant. His own dinner followed. 'Pyramids of new dishes, fine linen, beautiful porcelain, silver spoon and fork, an excellent soup, a slice of juicy beef, the leg of a broiled capon swimming in its gravy, a little dish of fried artichokes, one of spinach, a very fine pear, some grapes, a bottle of old Burgundy, and some of the best Mocha coffee.' His servant, on seeing this banquet, said, 'Monsieur, as you have just eaten my dinner, allow me in my turn to eat yours.' 'It is but just,' replied his master, and the valet entered upon the work.

"We may conclude, therefore, that Arouet did not have to wait long for his breakfast on the morning of his arrest, and that he had on that day, and every day, whatever was requisite for his bodily comfort. Indeed, we know that he dined sometimes with the governor. Almost every literary man of note who lived in the reign of Louis XV. was at least once a prisoner in the Bastille, and they agree in describing it as the least painful of prisons. There were but forty-two rooms in the structure, and many of them were usually vacant. There was much familiar intercourse between the prisoners and the officers of the château, and most of the prisoners, as it seems, received visitors in their rooms, and were allowed to keep a private store of wine and dainties for the entertainment of guests. They could send out for books published with permission. There was a billiard-room, a bowling-alley, and a large courtyard for exercise and conversation, to all of which most of the prisoners had some daily access. Persons accused of serious crime, or who had given offence to a favourite or a mistress, were treated with more severity; were compelled to take their exercise alone, under the eye of a sentinel; were confined to their rooms, and could not receive visitors. For contumacious or disorderly inmates there were dungeons, damp and dark, at the bottom of each of the eight towers; but these were seldom used, and never except for short periods."

His release from this easy captivity was followed by a positive piece of good fortune—the representation and success of *Œdipe*. The curious want of critical discernment which characterizes his present

biographer could hardly be better illustrated than by the fact, that after expatiating on the boy's early initiation and interest in the Racine-Corneille controversy, Mr. Parton quotes, without comment or indication of their insincerity, the words in which Voltaire tries to persuade the Duchess du Maine that he knew nothing about French plays, had never thought that love affairs could be mixed up with them, and had been determined to the writing of *Œdipe* solely by hearing the French translation of the *Iphigenia*, which her favourite, Malézieu, had executed at her command. Mr. Parton seems never to have heard of the Stone of Blarney, a historical monument which it was quite superfluous for Voltaire to visit or to venerate. There is, however, a full and interesting account of *Œdipe* and of its representation; when the play, in almost exactly the same way as its earlier contemporary, *Cato*, united, partly by good luck and partly owing to the adroitness of the poet, the suffrages of the most opposite parties in the State and in literature.

The history of Voltaire after *Œdipe* becomes better known, though certainly not less interesting. Presuming on his success, he wrote *Artemire* (Queen to Cassander, a king of the time of Alexander the Great, as Mr. Parton puts it, with the oddity which characterizes most of his allusions to classical matters), and *Artemire* was not a success. But socially his good fortune continued for the most part. He successfully rebutted the imputation of Lagrange-Chancel's *Philippiques* to him. He did not very clean work for Dubois. He was, alas! bastinadoed by the spy who had been the immediate cause of his imprisonment. But he made a kind of triumphant progress to Brussels, where his memorable quarrel with J. B. Rousseau took place; he laid the foundation of his fortune and got the *Henriade* with some difficulty printed in its first form. Then came the Rohan business, the second imprisonment, and the forced flight to England. Mr. Parton's account of this English Hegira and its results is interesting enough, despite some blunders (one gross one, for instance, about Sarah of Marlborough, whom he takes to have been Congreve's legatee), and despite a certain tendency to take Voltaire's lively dramatic accounts of what he might have seen in England for historic records of what he actually did see. I do not think the lines to Laura Harley, which if they were his unaided work show a very remarkable power of adaptation to the current fashions of verse in a foreign language, are even yet as well known as they should be:—

TO LAURA HARLEY.

“ Laura, would you know the passion
 You have kindled in my breast?
 Trifling is the inclination
 That by words can be expressed.

In my silence see the lover ;
 True love is by silence known ;
 In my eyes you'll best discover
 All the power of your own."

The exile came to an end, however. It had provided Voltaire with a good sum of money (Mr. Parton gives no good reason for thinking that the usual estimate of this sum is exaggerated); it had thoroughly confirmed him in the political and religious ideas, or rather in the ideas as to Church and State, which were to last him through life; and it had supplied him with the materials of those English Letters, which, though they brought him a good deal of trouble, are among the most striking and were among the most influential of his earlier works. It seems, however, that his exile had taught him caution, and he was more than ever intent upon making friends with the Mammon of unrighteousness:—

"After a short period, then, of apprehension and of wandering from one obscure lodging to another, we find him settled, restored to his rights and to his friends, hard at work upon his book, and sharing in the social life of Paris. He soon set Thieriot at work getting his pensions restored, and his arrears paid up; in which they succeeded, minus the deductions imposed on all pensioners by a cardinal avaricious for his king. Nor did he delay to put to good use those two or three thousand solid guineas that he brought from England. Accident helped him to a capital speculation. Supping one evening this spring with a lady of his circle, the conversation turned upon a lottery recently announced by the controller-general, Desforts, for liquidating certain onerous city annuities. La Condamine, the mathematician, who was one of the guests, remarked that any one who should buy all the tickets of this lottery would gain a round million. Voltaire silently reflected upon this statement. At the close of the feast he hurried away to moneyed friends,—doubtless to the brothers Paris, now restored to their career in Paris, who were closely allied to the richest banker of the day, Samuel Bernard. A company was formed; the tickets were all bought, and the prizes demanded. The controller-general, overwhelmed with confusion at this exposure of his blunder, refused to pay. The company appealed to the council, who decided in their favor. Voltaire gained a large sum by this happy stroke, exaggerated by one chronicler to half a million francs. He made, it is true, an enemy of the minister, who was *dévo*t; and he deemed it best to disappear from Paris, and spend some weeks with the Duke of Richelieu at the waters of Plombières; as lucky men with us go from Wall Street to Saratoga. But Desforts was soon after displaced, and the poet could safely return. Paris-Duverney did not forget the favour done him on this occasion, and before many years had rolled away he was able to make a substantial return in kind.

"Voltaire never wanted money again, and never missed a good opportunity to increase his store. Later in the year 1729 we see him dropping work, starting in a poste-chaise at midnight for Nancy, a hundred and fifty miles distant,—a ride of two nights and a day,—for the purpose of buying shares in public funds of the Duke of Lorraine. Arriving more dead than alive, he was informed that, by order of the duke, no shares were to be sold to strangers. But, as he related to President Hénault, 'after pressing solicitations, they let me subscribe to fifty shares (which were delivered to me eight days after), by reason of the happy resemblance of my name to that of one of his Royal Highness's gentlemen. I profited by the demand for this paper promptly enough. I have trebled my gold, and trust soon to enjoy my doubloons with people like you.' Ever after, as long as he lived, he was in the habit of performing feats of this

kind; as attentive to business as though he had no literature; as devoted to literature as though he had no business. His life was to be henceforth, as it had been hitherto, a continuous warfare with powers that wielded the resources of a kingdom. He had need to provide himself with the sinews of war."

Moreover, from this time he adopted a most elaborate system of precaution, and (as Mr. Parton, partial biographer as he is, frankly admits) disowned every dangerous work of his own with what some people may call remarkable courage and others remarkable effrontery. It was not very long, too, after the return from England that Voltaire "ranged himself," as such ranging went then, and took to house-keeping with Madame du Châtelet. Of the famous Cirey sojourn and all its ups and downs, the magnificence of the poet's installation, his business relationships with the useful Abbé Moussinot, his experiments with iron and the nature of fire, his entertaining of strangers, his perpetration of constant additional cantos of *Jeanne* and his subsequent terrors lest some one should get hold of them, his extraordinary wrath with Rousseau and Des Fontaines, his occasional escapes from the watchful jealousy of his Megæra (Mr. Parton calls it Megæra, an imputation on the unlucky wife of Hercules for which I know no warranty of scripture, and which I am much tempted to take in connection with a statement of his that a double false quantity of the most atrocious kind was "in the ancient Republic of Letters a capital offence")—of all these things full information will be found in these volumes. Madame de Graigny of course is the chief authority, and two extracts may be given from her to show the calms and storms of Cirey:—

"Between half past ten and half past one, they summon every one to coffee, which is taken in Voltaire's hall. The meal usually lasts an hour, more or less. Precisely at noon, the people who are called here the coachmen go to dinner. These coachmen are *the lord of the castle, the fat lady, and her son*; the latter never appearing except when there is something to be copied. After coffee, we—that is to say, Voltaire, madame, and myself—remain half an hour. Then he makes us a low bow, and tells us to go away; upon which we return to our rooms. Toward four o'clock, sometimes, we take a slight repast. At nine we sup, and remain together till midnight. *Dieu!* what suppers! They are always the suppers of Damocles. All the pleasures are in attendance; but, alas, how short is the time! Oh, *mon Dieu!* Nothing is wanting to them, not even the Damocles sword, which is represented by the swift flight of time. The lord of the castle takes his place at the table, does not eat, falls asleep, consequently says not a word, and goes out with the tray. . . . Yesterday, after supper, there was a charming scene. Voltaire had the pouts on account of a glass of Rhine wine which madame prevented his drinking; he would not read *Jeanne*, as he had promised, being in an extremely bad humor. The brother and myself, by force of pleasantries, succeeded at last in restoring him. The lady, who was also pouting, was unable to keep it up. All this made a scene of delicious jests, which lasted a long time, finishing with a canto of *Jeanne*, which was no better than that scene."

" . . . The more I talked, the less I convinced him. I was silent. This frightful scene lasted at least an hour; but it was nothing to what was coming

it was reserved for the lady to put the climax to it. She came into my room like a fury, screaming with passion and repeating almost the same things, while I still kept silence. Then she drew a letter from her pocket, and, almost thrusting it into my face, cried out, 'See, see the proof of your infamy! You are the most unworthy of creatures! You are a monster whom I took into my house, not from friendship, for I had none for you, but because you know not where else to go; and you have had the infamy to betray me, to assassinate me, to steal from my desk a work for the purpose of copying it.'

"Ah, my poor friend, where were you? The thunder-bolt which falls at the feet of the solitary traveller overwhelms him less than these words overwhelmed me. This is all I can recollect of the torrent of insults which she uttered; for I was so distracted that I soon ceased to hear and understand her. But she said much more, and unless Voltaire had restrained her she would have boxed my ears. To all that she said I only replied, 'Oh, be silent, madame; I am too unhappy for you to treat me so unworthily!'

"At these words Voltaire seized her round the waist, and snatched her away from me; for she said all this right in my teeth, and with such violent gestures that at every moment I expected she would strike me. When she had been removed, she strode up and down the room, uttering loud exclamations upon my infamy. Observe, all this was uttered in so loud a voice that Dubois [maid of Madame Graffigny], who was two rooms off, heard every word. For my part, I was long without the power to pronounce a syllable; I was neither dead nor alive."

This latter tempest in a teacup was only caused by one of Voltaire's periodical fits of hysteria about *Jeanne*, his very amusing and very disreputable daughter.

How long this life lasted and how tragically it ended most people are aware. Mr. Parton, except in the matter of physical charms, as to which, though the evidence is conflicting to a bewildering extent, I am inclined to think he is unjust to her, is better disposed towards the respectable Emily than some of her lover's biographers and critics. It is very probable that what with geometry and flirtation, irregularity at meals (though it may be doubted whether it is in the nature of woman to be regular in this respect), and still greater irregularity of temper, she led Voltaire a life. But on the whole he probably found his account in the questionable connection. How bitterly he regretted her may be judged, far better than from the constantly quoted and grotesque rebuke to the young gentleman whom an odd fate made rival to both the greatest men of letters of France, from a passage of Longchamp which is not so frequently cited as it deserves to be, but which Mr. Parton duly gives:—

"During the nights [says Longchamp] he would get up, all agitation, and, fancying he saw Madame du Châtelet, he would call to her, and drag himself with difficulty from room to room, as if in search of her. It was the end of October, and the cold was already somewhat severe. In the middle of a certain night, when he could not sleep, he got up out of bed, and after groping a few steps about the room he felt so weak that he leaned against a table to keep from falling. He remained standing there a long time, shivering with cold, and yet reluctant to wake me. At length he forced himself to go into the next room, where almost all his books were heaped upon the floor. But he was far from remembering this, and, his head always filled with the same object, he was

endeavoring to traverse the room, when, running against a pile of folios, he stumbled and fell. Unable to rise, he called me several times; but so feeble was his voice that at first I did not hear him, although I slept near by. Waking, at last, I heard him groan and faintly repeat my name. I sprang up, and ran toward him. Having no light, and going very fast, my feet became entangled with his, and I fell upon him. Upon getting up, I found him speechless and almost frozen. I made hasty to lift him to his bed, and, having struck a light and made a great fire, I endeavored to warm him by wrapping his body and limbs in very hot cloths. That produced a good effect. Gradually I saw him coming to himself; he opened his eyes, and, recognizing me, he said that he felt very tired and had need of rest. Having covered him well and closed his curtains, I remained in his room the rest of the night. He soon fell asleep, and did not wake until near eleven in the morning."

The circumstances of this pathetic experience were in themselves sufficiently pathetic. The quasi-widower had removed to a waste Paris house with all the household gods of Ferney, identified for years to him with Madame du Châtelet, piled in disorder and desolation about the rooms. By degrees he got his Parisian household into better condition. But Paris, as every biographer has remarked, was never a fortunate or congenial residence to him, and the famous invitation to Berlin, which had so remarkable a result, came in more ways than one at a lucky moment. Madame du Châtelet was dead, and he was too old, and probably in his queer fashion too faithful, to attempt another *ménage* of the same kind; while he was not quite old enough to play the patriarch afar off as he afterwards did. He had tried court life at Paris with every advantage, and had found that it would not do. The immediate result of the emigration to fresh fields may have been questionably satisfactory, but there is no doubt that it acted as a tonic and fortifier in the long run.

From the moment when Voltaire set out for Berlin his life divides itself into three or four sharply separated acts, the scenes of which are tolerably familiar even to the most superficially instructed person. The sojourn in Prussia; the fluctuations in *partibus fidelium et infidelium* which followed; the residence at the Délices and at Ferney; the final and fatal pilgrimage to Paris, with the purpose not of worshipping but of being worshipped—are much more generally known than anything which precedes them. Mr. Parton has endeavoured to tell their history with the same good-will which shows itself in the rest of his book. As before, all or nearly all the facts are there. Some hundred and fifty large and well-filled pages are devoted to the celebrated sojourn which demonstrated the disadvantages of having two kings in Brentford, when one has all the physical and the other most of the intellectual force at his disposal, and when there is no regular concordat between them. An extract from Mr. Parton may illustrate the sorrowful condition of the physically weaker in the days when flight had become necessary to him. It is a pleasing

parallel to the plan of the elder Mr. Weller for rescuing Mr. Pickwick from the Philistines:—

“I went sometimes to walk with him in a large garden belonging to the house. When he wanted to be alone, he would say to me, ‘Now leave me to dream [*rêvasser*] a little.’ That was his expression, and he would continue his walk. One evening, in this garden, after having talked together upon his situation, he asked me if I knew how to drive a wagon drawn by two horses. I reflected upon it a moment, and, as I know that his ideas must not be at once contradicted, I replied in the affirmative. ‘Listen,’ said he to me. ‘I have thought of a way to get out of this country. You can buy two horses. It will not after that be difficult to purchase a wagon. When we have horses it will not appear strange to make a provision of hay.’ ‘Very well, Sir,’ said I; ‘what shall we do with a wagon, horses, and hay?’ ‘Why, this: We will fill the wagon with hay. In the middle of the hay we will put all our baggage. I will place myself, disguised, upon the hay, and give myself out for a Protestant pastor who is going to see one of his married daughters in the neighbouring town. You will be my wagoner. We will follow the shortest roads to the frontiers of Saxony, where we will sell wagon, horses, and hay; after that we will take post for Leipsic.’ He could not keep from laughing in communicating to me this project, and he accompanied his account with a thousand gay and curious reflections. I answered him that I would do what he wanted, and that I was disposed to give him all proofs of devotion that depended upon me; but that not knowing German, I should not be able to reply to the questions which would be asked me. Besides, not knowing very well how to drive, I could not answer for not upsetting my pastor in some ditch, which would grieve me much. We finished by laughing together over the scheme. He did not much count upon realizing it; but he loved to imagine means of leaving a country where he regarded himself as a prisoner. ‘My friend,’ said he to me, ‘if permission to go does not come in a little while, I will know some way or other of leaving the island of Alcina.’ Since they had burnt his book, he feared more than ever princes and nobles, and vaunted unceasingly the pleasure of living free and far from them.”

Mr. Parton’s account of these amusing but deplorable incidents is full, accurate in the main, and a great deal less prejudiced on Voltaire’s side than Mr. Carlyle’s is on Frederick’s, though it is impossible to acquit the biographer of taking too lenient a view both of the Hirsch matter and of the Dr. Akakia business. The account of the sad Frankfort days is particularly minute; and for the special purposes which Mr. Parton’s book is fitted to subserve, it is perhaps not much of a drawback that he seems a little insensible to the ludicrous side of the matter. But Voltaire, as all men know, survived with his own peculiar vitality this crisis, which like his *bastinadoings*, imprisonments, complaisances to L’Infâme in the matter of bowing in the house of Rimmon, and other incidents of his singular career, would have been fatal to a man of less genius. He hovered about the outskirts of France till it was obvious that Paris was impossible, and then established himself at Geneva. Perhaps there is on the whole no document which so thoroughly explains the circumstances and the men with which Voltaire had to battle as the

Duke de la Vallière's letter of conciliation, which thus appears in Mr. Parton's version :—

"I have received, my dear Voltaire, the *sermon* [poem on the Lisbon earthquake] which you sent me, and, despite the sound philosophy which reigns in it, it has inspired me with more respect for its author than for its moral. Another effect which it has had upon me is to determine me to ask of you the greatest mark of friendship which you could possibly give me. You are nearly sixty years of age; I avow it. You have not the most robust health; I believe it. But you have the most beautiful genius and the best-balanced head; of that I am sure. And if you were to commence a new career under the guise of a young man of fifteen, though he should live longer than Fontenelle, you would furnish him with matter enough to render him the most illustrious man of his age. I do not fear, then, to ask you to send me some psalms embellished by your versification. You alone have been, and are, worthy to translate them. You will obliterate J. B. Rousseau; you will inspire edification; and you will put it in my power to give the greatest pleasure to madame. . . . It is no longer Mérope, nor Sully, nor Metastasio, that we want, but a little David. Imitate him; enrich him. I shall admire your work, and shall not be jealous of it, provided it be reserved to me, poor sinner that I am, to surpass it with my 'Betzabée.' I shall be content; and you will add to my satisfaction in granting me what I ask with the greatest importunity. Give me one hour a day; show the psalms to no one; and I will instantly have an edition of them published at the Louvre, which will yield as much honour to the author as pleasure to the public. I say to you again, I am sure she will be enchanted with it; and I shall be enchanted also that through you I give her a pleasure so great. I have long relied upon your friendship, as you know; and therefore I expect to receive immediately the first-fruits of a certain success which I am preparing for you. But I do not for this release you from your promise to send me the royal 'Mérope' [Frederic's opera], and the defence of my dear friend, 'Jeanne' [La Pucelle]. Adieu, my dear Voltaire; I expect news from you with the greatest impatience. You are sure of my sincere friendship; you can rely not less upon my genuine gratitude."

After a few years the *Délices* were exchanged for Ferney, a residence which had several advantages. It was in France, though hardly of it, and Voltaire's patriotism, a very real quality, was gratified at the same time as his wish to be out of the immediate clutches of L'Infâme, while he could give himself more liberty than under the still austere rule of Geneva. It conferred on him privileges of which he made no bad use, though some of his seignorial airs gave Fréron an opportunity which he did not neglect. It enabled him, too, to play in a fairly business-like manner at Providence. His farm and his watchmaker colony pleased himself and did a good deal of good to other people. Here is his own description of the former. It reminds one curiously of Bolingbroke's adoption at Dawley (which, by the way, is not in Shropshire, as Mr. Parton seems to think elsewhere) of the motto, *Satis beatus ruris honoribus* :—

"A vast rustic house, with wagons loaded with the spoils of the fields coming and going by four great gateways. The pillars of oak, which sustain the whole frame, are placed at equal distances upon pedestals of stone; long stables are seen on the right and on the left. Fifty cows, properly fastened, occupy one

side, with their calves; the horses and oxen are on the other side; their fodder falls into their racks from immense mows above; the floors where the grain is threshed are in the middle, and you know that all the animals lodged in their several places in this great edifice have a lively sense that the forage, the hay, the oats, which it contains, belong to them of right. To the south of these beautiful monuments of agriculture are the poultry-yards and sheep-folds; to the north are the presses, store-rooms, fruit-houses; to the east are the abodes of the manager and thirty servants; towards the west extend large meadows, pastured and fertilized by all these animals, companions of the labour of man. The trees of the orchard, loaded with fruits, small and great, are still another source of wealth. Four or five hundred bee-hives are set up near a little stream which waters this orchard. The bees give to the possessor a considerable harvest of honey and wax, without his troubling himself with all the fables which are told of that industrious creature; without endeavoring in vain to learn whether that nation lives under the rule of a pretended queen, who presents her subjects with sixty to eighty thousand children. There are some avenues of mulberry-trees as far as the eye can reach, the leaves of which nourish those precious worms which are not less useful than the bees. A part of this vast inclosure is formed by an impenetrable rampart of hawthorn, neatly clipped, which rejoices the sense of smell and sight.”¹

Here many years were passed, while Voltaire became a centre of pilgrimage to literary Europe, and his literary energy continued and almost increased. Mr. Parton, though perhaps he has hardly dwelt on this interesting period at a length quite proportionate to his accounts of some earlier periods of the patriarch’s life, still deserves, especially in the famous matters of Calas, &c., the credit of fulness and accuracy. By degrees Voltaire began to feel the approaches of old age unmistakably; and if Madame Denis did not do much to lighten his sufferings, there were others who were more thoughtful:—

“He went to bed about ten, and usually slept until five in the morning. Barbara, his housekeeper, whom he used to call *bonne-Baba*, would then come into his room and bring in his breakfast, which was ordinarily coffee and cream. ‘Another day, my *bonne-Baba*,’ he would say, when she appeared. ‘Tomorrow, perhaps, you will be no longer troubled about me. When I shall be out yonder, asleep in my tomb, there will be no more bother of getting my breakfast, nor fear of being scolded.’ One day, Duvernet adds, after she had brought him his coffee and gone out again, he took it into his head to perfume the coffee from a bottle of rose-water at his side. This mixture immediately produced nausea and palpitation. He rang violently, and Baba, terrified, ran to him as fast as she could. ‘What is the matter, then, monsieur?’ she cried, on entering. ‘My good Baba,’ said he, ‘I am in the agonies of death. I put some rose-water into my coffee, and it is killing me.’ She replied, ‘Oh, monsieur, with all your *esprit*, you are sillier than your own turkeys.’ ‘I know it well, good Baba,’ he replied; ‘but you, who are a woman of good sense, hinder me from dying!’ He was speedily relieved, and the story remained one of the numerous jests of the château.

One of the pleasantest personages who move across the stage of Voltaire’s life—perhaps the very pleasantest—is Reine Philiberte de

1 Voltaire to Dupont. June, 1769.

Varicourt, otherwise Belle-et-Bonne. Most men probably, except a very unfortunate minority, have at some time or other their Belle-et-Bonne, some one who is connected with them neither by the commonplace ties of relationship nor by the frail and uncomfortable bonds of passion, but who either in person or as a possession of memory is their ideal of womanly affection, grace, and charm. Sometimes Belle-et-Bonne presents herself in early life, and only an accident prevents her becoming something else than a Belle-et-Bonne, something which in its turn not unfrequently becomes Laide-et-Méchante. Sometimes any such connection is prevented by prior ties on one side or on both, or by an acknowledgment on the part of the friends that the philosophy of Doralice is, after all, the wisest, and that "'tis better as it is. We have drawn off already as much of our love as would run clear, the rest is but jealousies and disquiets, and quarrelling and piecing." Sometimes, again, Belle-et-Bonne makes her appearance when the heyday in the blood is over, and is as a daughter, with the additional charm that her affection is not a matter of duty. This was Voltaire's case. He saved Reine de Varicourt when she was eighteen from the living tomb of a convent, and with the full consent of Madame Denis adopted her and installed her at Ferney, where she was not merely daughter, but almoner, deputy-manager of the household, and general good angel.

"She made herself the solace and charm of his existence, enlivening every day, adorning every festival, greeting him with caresses in the morning, and giving brilliancy and gladness to the evening. At the *fête* of St. Francis, celebrated every year in Ferney by the whole colony with great enthusiasm, she shone with engaging lustre, walking in the procession adorned with flowers, and carrying in her hand a basket containing her two pet doves with white wings and rosy beaks, smiling and blushing as she passed.

"She loved to wait upon him. He had contrived a hanging-desk over his bed, which he could lower or raise at pleasure, upon which were placed all the means of continuing his work at any hour day or night. It was her hand that put this apparatus in order at night, and arranged his bed as he liked to have it. She took charge of the minor needs and habits of the old man; while he, on his part, loved to give her lessons in dancing, and to show her how the great ladies of the court paid their homage to the king and queen. On his table he always kept a box with money in it for the poor, and now this store was given in charge to Belle-et-Bonne. 'She is,' he would say, using a convent expression, 'my *sœur du pot*,' and she carried the purse of the poor *ex officio*. It was remarked by the household that, in her presence, he was never in ill-humor, and that, in the midst of his demonstrative and harmless anger, if she appeared upon the scene, the tempest was instantly stilled. 'You put me on good terms with myself,' he would say to her. 'I cannot be angry before you.' When she entered in the morning, he would say sometimes, 'Good-morning, *belle nature!*' as he kissed her forehead. She, apt to catch the humor of the place, would reply, as she kissed his cheek, 'Good-morning, *mon dieu tutélaire!*' He wondered how she could be willing to place her smooth young face against his death's head, and when she repeated the application he would say it

was Life and Death embracing.¹ Not the least of her triumphs was that she could be all this to the uncle and retain the lively affection of the niece."

The last scene, like the sojourn at Berlin, is among the best known, but I do not know that in English it has been told before so fully. Mr. Parton is inclined to acquit Madame Denis, in part at least, of the abominable plot of which she is accused by Wagnière, the stratagem of inducing her uncle to remain at Paris at the risk of his life by a false note of warning as to the hostile intentions of the Court. The good lady was perfectly capable of anything that selfishness and ingratitude could suggest, but the powers of life were distinctly failing in Voltaire, and the question of the end was probably a question only of months, perhaps of days. He had lived a very different life from Fontenelle; and, with all deference to professional opinion, it may be doubted whether in any case he would have equalled the days of that easy-going personage. Perhaps Mr. Parton (carrying out a principle which he announces in his preface of passing over idle rumours instead of combating them) has been too little emphatic in his account of the quiet and composure which, according to the best authorities, distinguished Voltaire's end. There is every reason for believing that his death was distinguished by a placidity and dignity which had too often failed him in the more trying and sometimes even in the less trying circumstances of his life.

Of nearly all the events of this remarkable life Mr. Parton has given an account, sometimes faulty in form, but sufficient and complete in substance. His book, though it may give some new facts, will of course not materially alter the idea of Voltaire to those who have previously studied his life and his works; but to those who do not already possess much knowledge of him it furnishes a convenient means of informing themselves. A book of thirteen hundred pages, deformed by American misspelling of the English tongue, and by references to "inflationists" and such-like irrelevances, not to mention constant expressions of the author's sentiments, which are, to say the least, unimportant, may seem a formidable undertaking. But its copiousness of incident and anecdote and its abundant quotations lighten the task of reading very considerably. At the end of it he must be a somewhat thoughtless reader (if, indeed, any such be likely to reach the end) who does not endeavour to make up for himself, assisted by the critical comments of those of Mr. Parton's predecessors to whom Pallas has been more kind, some notion of the singular personality here portrayed. Mr. Parton's own notion of that personality is decided enough. In his own marvellous language he tells us that Voltaire's empty sepulchre "is vocal, it is resonant, it booms and thunders over the earth." The

¹ Duvernet, page 435. Paris, 1797.

superstition-crusher pushes everything and everybody else aside in his estimate. I think, for my own part, that from such a standpoint it is as difficult to judge Voltaire rightly as from that of my friend who called him a wretch, from that of Johnson, or from that of George III.

The truth seems to be that Voltaire was an extremely complicated character; the wonderful diversity of his literary work only reflects this complexity in part, though the one no doubt is the reason of the other. As I can hardly think of any man who displayed so many different forms of the literary faculty, so I can hardly think of any man, whether of letters or of business, who united the capacity and in a way the actual performance of so many different parts. Of his varied ability in practical administrative business there is proof almost as ample as of his varied ability in literary work. If he failed anywhere in what he undertook it was in diplomacy, and it is fair to remember that he had an antagonist to contend with there by whom it was no shame to be beaten. He has not, like Wordsworth, left us explicit intimations that in his own opinion his mission was to be Prime Minister, or Archbishop of Canterbury, or Commander-in-Chief, or Lord Chancellor, or all of them together. But I have no doubt that if the opportunity of any or all of these posts had come in his way he would have accepted it cheerfully, and would have performed the duties on the whole very well. The complementary defect of the quality of Jack-of-all-trades is well known. Voltaire suffered from it less than most people, but he did suffer from it. In no literary style, except in that of satirical prose fiction, or allegory of the social kind, can he be said to have attained the highest mastery. In work requiring research of any kind he was rather rapid than thorough, and he carried to excess the national habit of hasty deduction from insufficiently investigated premises. His moral and intellectual character, with which we are here more specially concerned, shows inconsistencies and blemishes of all kinds. Let us try and sum up what the devil's advocates say against him. He was an unscrupulous liar; he was extraordinarily vain; he was utterly destitute of reverence; he had an impure imagination, which was not checked by the slightest sense of even external decency; he was given to filthy lucre; he was spiteful and revengeful in the extreme towards his personal enemies. This is an ugly catalogue, and it is unfortunately true that no single article in it can be struck out entirely by the most uncompromising defender who knows and respects the facts. Mitigating pleas are all that is possible. His lying, which is a very unpleasant feature to English examiners of his character, has to be taken in conjunction with the fact that it was, so to speak, official and professional lying for the most part. The absurd and iniquitous political and social system of the time and country necessitated and in a manner recog-

nised it. It was little more than the conventional "not guilty," not so much as the equally conventional "not at home." The charge of vanity must be admitted *sans phrase*, but it is not a very damning one. The lack of reverence also is not contestable, though there are some circumstances on the other side, notably the mountain-top story, which I have not noticed in Mr. Parton, and his lifelong cult of the starry heavens. This was, however, a distinct and inevitable consequence of his peculiar faculty of ridicule, which must also excuse as far as it can (and that is not very far) the uncleanness of his writings. I shall frankly own that that uncleanness is to me the most unpleasant variety of the disease that I know, with the possible exception of Dryden's. His carrying out of the maxim *non olet* is another blot on his character. There is nothing inexcusable, though perhaps there is something rather undignified, in a poet's making money by stockbroking and money-changing; but the Hirsch matter, as to which something has been said already, cannot be defended, and the persistent way in which the author of *L'Homme aux Quarante Ans* and a hundred other protests against financial mismanagement allowed himself to profit by contracts, loans, and so forth, where the profit was due to corrupt administration, is a still greater blot. With respect to Fréron, Desfontaines, et Cie., perhaps the worst thing that can be said about Voltaire is that in point of malignity there is sometimes nothing and generally very little to choose between himself and his adversaries.

And yet I have not the least intention of admitting that Voltaire was a wretch, or anything of the kind. All the worst of his faults were emphatically the faults of his time and his education. His merits, on the other hand, were personal and his own, a distinction which, however hackneyed it may be, is almost the only one available in this world of ours. These merits Mr. Parton's book ought to make clear to everybody who is not hopelessly prejudiced. One of the chief of them was an extraordinary kindness of heart and affection for his friends, relations, and, indeed, everybody with whom he was not brought into violent collision. Madame du Châtelet and Madame Denis, the feminine plagues of the greater part of his long life, certainly had nothing to complain of in him. Notwithstanding his occasional fits of ill-temper all his servants and dependants were fond of him, and even the passionate Collini did not find those fits intolerable. His friendship for Thioriot, a person of very doubtful merit, and not unfrequently, as in the Desfontaines affair, and in the matter of the employments which Voltaire sought to procure for him from Richelieu, a troublesome and even treacherous friend, was unwearying. No one, even of his enemies, fails to acknowledge his remarkable benevolence to oppressed or unfortunate persons of every degree of merit, from Calas and Lally to La

Barre and Desfontaines. Something, perhaps, must be allowed for his love of playing the grand seigneur in estimating his good deeds at Ferney; but even when that allowance is made a solid amount will remain to his credit. Unscrupulous as he was in some ways in the getting of money, he neither spent it unworthily nor hoarded it for the mere sake of hoarding; his object being, as has been said, the securing of independence, which in his time and country no man, who was neither a priest nor a noble, could hope for without a competent estate. These things are, of course, perfectly well known to students of French literature and French history; but the general reader is less likely to be acquainted with them. Such a reader will find in Mr. Parton's book a good deal to amuse him, and a good deal to correct and heighten his idea of Voltaire as a man. It has been hinted that the merits of the book, as a literary commentary, are hardly equal to its merits as a repository of fact. In the former respect, however, as has also been suggested, more than one *scriptor haud paulo melior quam ego aut*, Mr. Parton has supplied the deficiency in English by anticipation, and it is therefore superfluous to say any more on that score.

GEORGE SAINTSBURY

TWO ACTS OF UNION: A CONTRAST.

ENGLISH policy has achieved no triumph so great as the union between England and Scotland. The work, indeed, of Godolphin and of Somers may claim to be the most brilliant and successful example of constructive statesmanship on record. English policy has never more nearly failed of attaining any part of its objects than in the union with Ireland. The work of Pitt and of Cornwallis is a monument, if not of absolute failure, yet of disappointed hopes, which after the experience of eighty years proves the sagacity of Burko's forecast that "a nominal union of government" need not produce "a close union of interest and affection." The two Acts of Union have nevertheless a close superficial resemblance; the latter statute was suggested by and moulded upon the earlier legislative precedent.

These are the patent facts. They inevitably raise the question why is it that similar measures have produced disastrously dissimilar results? The answer which Englishmen give with more or less distinctness is, that the difference of results lies in the difference between Scotch and Irish character. The true lesson, they think, to be deduced from a comparison of Scotch and Irish history is that justice and wisdom and statesmanship, as understood, at least, by Englishmen, will not bear their proper fruit on Irish soil, and that at the time of the Union, as at other times, the prudence and benevolence of England have been balked of their legitimate reward by the innate perversity or folly of Irish nature.

This is the popular reading of history. It has a superficial plausibility. It is, however, in reality one of those gross misinterpretations of past events which, while it deduces from one set of transactions a totally false moral, conceals from view the strangely overlooked fact that the relations between England and Scotland before the Union do read a most instructive lesson in reference to the circumstances which have perplexed the relations between England and Ireland. That this is so may be shown, not by fine-spun arguments or the production of out-of-the-way knowledge, but by the simple statement of facts which lie on the very surface of history.

To explain the success of the Union with Scotland (for in political operations so difficult as that of blending two separate, and not very friendly, nations into one state it is success, not want of success, which needs explanation) is all but to unfold the grounds of the failure of the Union with Ireland, since the shortest summary of the whole matter is that special causes favoured or produced the incorporation of Scotland with England, and that each one of those conditions was conspicuously wanting to the attempt to unite Ireland with Great Britain.

The success of the Union with Scotland is due in the main to three causes.

First.—The Act of Union embodied what was not in name only, but in reality, a treaty or contract freely made between two independent States.

No bargain between two landowners, the richer of whom is bent on purchasing from his poor neighbour a piece of ground of no value in itself, but essential to the enjoyment of the rich man's estate, was ever made with more businesslike deliberation and with more prosaic coolness than the agreement by which the national independence of Scotland was exchanged for the material and moral advantages of incorporation with Great Britain. Sentiments, such as the feelings which have fused Italy or Germany into one country, played no part in the matter. Statesmen had dreamed for generations of the strength to be gained by bringing the two parts of the same island under one and the same sovereign power, but schemes which pleased the intellect of politicians did not command any general sympathy whatever in any portion of what is now Great Britain. At the end of the last century there was no love lost between Scotchmen and Englishmen. Hence—what in the long run turned out a great advantage—the tardiness with which proposals for national amalgamation were accepted. At one moment the attempt to unite threatened to create permanent and irreparable severance. Not one Englishman in ten thousand knows the "Act of Security" even by name, and a generation who are as much at home in Midlothian as in Middlesex, are astonished to discover that in 1704 the Scotch Parliament wrung from Anne her assent to an Act which in effect provided that on her death the Crown of Scotland should no longer rest on the head of the same person as the Crown of England. Our forefathers knew what was meant, and at once retaliated. They made preparations for arming the northern counties; and in the very Act which provided for a Treaty of Union, enacted that from the end of 1705 until the succession to the Crown of Scotland should be settled on the same line as was adopted by the Parliament of England, no native of Scotland should possess the privileges of a natural born Englishman, and that in the meantime no arms should be conveyed from England to Scotland, and that ultimately no coals, no cattle, or native linen should be imported from Scotland. The last provision touched Scotchmen to the quick. The generation who planned the Darien scheme were wild with ideas of the wealth to be gained from colonial enterprise, and burned to share once more as under the Protectorate all the mercantile advantages of England. In plain truth, it was the passion for trade which overcame the Scotch passion for independence. "I remember," writes Mr. Burton, "a talk with the great historian of the English Revolution. . . . He said he believed I had been studying the Union. . . . He saw some points of diffi-

culty; one was that although the Union was notoriously unpopular in Scotland, yet there were symptoms of pressure on the side of Scotland in its direction. He had thought whether this might be the action of the Episcopalian party to obtain protection from England, but that did not seem a satisfactory explanation. *I said I believed he would find a simple solution in the urgency of the Scotch for participation in the English trade, and that he would find his way to this solution in the laws of the Protectorate and those of the Restoration.* I find in a short letter from him, dated 20th November, 1852, immediately on returning to his own books, 'I have looked into the question of the commercial relations between England and Scotland after the Restoration. You were quite right, and the subject is full of interest.'"

The words in italics go to the root of the matter. Scotch enthusiasm for independence was not insincere, but it was factitious. The Scotch hunger for trade was as genuine and as strong a sentiment as it was reasonable. When the negotiations for the Union began, the statesmen of each nation knew exactly the true state of affairs; they went into conference, so to speak, with charged pistols, but it was well understood that the object of violent demonstrations was the attainment of peaceable advantages, and that arms were not to be used if the negotiators could see their way to a profitable bargain. Of the former occasions on which offers of Union had been once and again rejected; of the debates in the Scotch Parliament; of the Jacobite agitation which ensured that every argument which could be used against the Union should be pressed with the utmost force; of the excitement of the Edinburgh mob; of the hard-headed coolness of the commissioners who, for two months, debated in London all the minutiae of the treaty with more elaboration and with far more sense than the Imperial Parliament now applies to the details of the Land Bill; of all the particulars, interesting as they are, of the most important treaty ever negotiated by England—this is not the occasion to write. The one essential point to impress on modern readers is, that the Union was in truth a treaty, the result of a perfectly fair bargain, deliberately made by most capable agents fully authorised to bind their principals. Nor is there ground to impute anything like gross corruption to the Scotchmen who favoured the connection with England. What was called bribery seems to have amounted to little more than the payment by the English Government of official debts due from the Scotch Crown. If leading men looked after their own interest, they assuredly looked keenly after the interest of their own country; a broker may be honest though he takes a commission. The Union between the two countries was not a marriage of affection, nor even of esteem, but it was a marriage of convenience freely made, the settlements were carefully drawn and were made on the part of

England with the utmost liberality, and good settlements contribute considerably to the permanence of matrimonial comfort.

The Union with Ireland lacked all that element of free consent between independent contracting parties which lies at the basis of every genuine contract. The idea of union came from London. Of the Irishmen who ultimately supported it many deemed it a mad scheme. In the English Parliament Sheridan could protest in language which even now is impressive against the indecency of inducing Irishmen to surrender an independence which the wisest and best men in the country prized highly at a moment when the land was filled with troops, when one part of the population were kept down only by military force, and when the other part were trembling with panic and fury, excited by the horrors of the Rebellion. Of the deliberate negotiation, of the calm, satisfactory, business-like haggling for national advantages which marked the negotiations between the Scotch and the English Commissioners, of the close consideration of minute details by competent representatives of both countries, there is not a trace in the negotiations, if such they can be called, between England and Ireland. There was enough, indeed, and more than enough, of negotiations of a certain kind, but their object was to secure, not that Ireland should get any special advantage, but that lords, bishops, and boroughmongers should get their fair share in the lavish bribery by which the Irish Parliament was induced to surrender national independence. To say, indeed, what was exactly the condition of Irish opinion is now impossible. Of the few persons who possess the knowledge fewer still possess the impartiality necessary to balance conflicting statements against each other. One or two facts are patent—the Irish Protestants were dazed with horror at the massacres of the Rebellion; the Irish Catholics were lulled into acquiescence by promises which were only made to be broken; no appeal was made to the Irish constituencies; and the members of both Houses of Parliament were corrupted. The Act of Union was, in short, an agreement which, could it have been referred to a court of law, must at once have been cancelled as a contract hopelessly tainted with fraud and coercion. The arrangement pressed or forced by England upon Ireland was perhaps the best for the interest of both countries which the times permitted; but it is childish to suppose that such an arrangement could command from Irishmen the respect with which Scotchmen and Englishmen alike soon learnt to regard a treaty which was as genuine and honest a compact as was ever made between two States.

Secondly.—The authors of the Union with Scotland rose far above the level of ordinary English statesmanship, and displayed a sagacious foresight and liberal breadth of view not often displayed before or since by English Ministers.

As one studies in its details the remedy applied by the Whigs to the Scotch difficulty, which in 1706 was, at least, as great and menacing as was the Irish difficulty in 1800, one understands the profound reverence which the heroes of the English Revolution commanded among all classes of Englishmen, until the day when the dramatic scenes of the French Revolution obliterated for a time the memory of leaders, any one of whom possessed more political capacity than was to be found among the whole gang of revolutionists whose one idea of policy was to send every opponent to the guillotine. The creators of the state of Great Britain had a firm grasp of principle. Their aim was to transform two nations into one; hence they insisted with unwavering resolution on everything essential to the attainment of their end. They would not concede the least trifle which savoured of federation; they would not leave in existence a vestige of separate Scotch Government. The measure, therefore, for uniting the two kingdoms was, unlike most Acts of English legislation, a thorough-going piece of workmanship intended fully to achieve its end; it left nothing to be settled by one amending Act after another, drawn to fill up the imperfect outlines of a crude and ill-conceived scheme. But just because the statesmen of the eighteenth century knew how to cling to principle, and dared to frame a consistent measure which contained everything that was essential for its object, they were both ready and willing to make every possible concession to Scotch interests or prejudices in every matter not essential to the attainment of their main purpose. Favour was shown throughout to the weaker nation; the Scotch from a merely mercantile point of view got by far the best of the bargain. The discussions as to the "equivalent," as to the African Company, as to the land tax, as to the coinage, as to the duty on beer and the like, are now forgotten. The one point worthy of remembrance is, that every advantage was conceded to Scotland. We can hardly in modern times duly estimate the miraculous foresight and magnanimity implied in this liberality. At the commencement of the eighteenth century every Englishman, and every Scotchman for that matter, believed in mercantile theories, resting on the assumption that the prosperity of one nation must be the loss of another. The mercantile classes were then rising into influence, and merchants and shopkeepers were, it must be added, the strongest support of the Protestant succession; yet at a time when every trader believed that liberality to Scotch rivals meant the ruin of his own business, English statesmen dared for once to act on the bold assumption that the interests of Scotland and England were so completely identical that, the most ample concessions to the poorer country would prove in the long run for the benefit of both. "How much have you lost by the participation of Scotland in all your commerce? The external trade of England has more than doubled since that period, and I believe your internal

(which is the most advantageous) has been augmented at least four-fold. Such virtue there is in liberality of sentiment that you have grown richer even by the partnership of poverty." Thus writes Burke after an experience of seventy years had demonstrated the truth of principles which, even in 1778, were beyond the grasp of the merchants of Bristol. But to anticipate in 1706 that the partnership of poverty would produce unbounded prosperity argues something like prophetic foresight. "If I marry a beggar," said Sir Edward Seymour, "I shall have a louse for my portion." His coarse dictum sums up the antipathies and convictions which swayed a generation of Englishmen who, by some strange good fortune, consented to be led by statesmen, the wisdom of whose views they could scarcely comprehend.

The policy of Pitt and the adroitness of Castlereagh never rose to anything like the level of the statesmanship of Godolphin and of Somers. The scheme of Union with Ireland lacks all the completeness and coherence which marked the precedent on which it was in a sense modelled. The maintenance, for instance, of the Lord Lieutenancy is essentially opposed to the very idea of complete national union. Possibly the politicians of 1800 were right in believing that a Lord Lieutenant could not be dispensed with. But to grant that they were right in this is almost to concede that the time for union between England and Ireland had not arrived. In any case an institution which implies something like national separation was and is in theory inconsistent with the theory of absolute national unity. Nor were the framers of the Act of Union with Ireland able to confer on the Irish those material benefits which every Scotchman knew and felt to be the solid and immediate payment for the sacrifice of Scotch independence. The transactions of 1779 and 1780 made it impossible to identify, in the minds of Irishmen, the existence of the Union with the freedom and prosperity of trade. Whether Ireland could in any case turn to immediate advantage the removal of restrictions, the evil of which did not cease with their removal, had been doubted long before the Union by those who best knew the state of the country. In any case Irish freedom of trade was in the main due to the Irish volunteers and the Irish Parliament. The circumstances of the case made it impossible to render a policy which was an outrage on public sentiment tolerable or popular, on account of the obvious service which it rendered to private interest. The Irish Union had, indeed, one great chance in its favour. It was obviously possible by Catholic emancipation to make every Roman Catholic feel that to union with Great Britain he owed his rights of citizenship. But the one circumstance which might have been used to enlist Irish sentiment in favour of the Union was so misused as in fact to bring Roman Catholics into a position of distinct antagonism to the British Parliament, and one may almost say to generate the cry for Repeal.

Thirdly.—The institutions for which Scotchmen seriously cared were maintained or secured by the Union.

The statesmen of the Revolution were entirely free from the passion for producing that kind of uniformity which modern innovators confound with national unity. The law and the local institutions of Scotland were, except where they conflicted with the very principle of union with England, left carefully untouched. The one great national institution—the Church of Scotland—derived new security, and probably increased power, from the means which politically amalgamated Scotland and England.

This is a matter which deserves careful consideration. Every nation possesses some institution or institutions which express and represent its real life. Such an institution was, at any rate at the beginning of the last century, the Church of Scotland. It played at least as great a part in the daily life of the people as does or ever did the English Parliament in the life of England. National sentiment had gathered round the Church, and, fortunately for the prosperity of Great Britain, had not centred round the Parliament of Scotland. Of this circumstance English statesmanship took every advantage. The 25th Article of the Act of Union made the Scotch Church as secure as any enactment can make any institution. Every Presbyterian throughout Scotland, moreover, knew and felt that in union with England, and in strict support of the Protestant succession, which was thenceforth bound up with the existence of the British State, lay his real safeguard against Jacobite reaction and the renewal of the struggles with Episcopalianism, which had been the torment of the country. The abolition of the Scotch Parliament no doubt pained national sentiment, but the Presbyterian clergy—the most influential class in the country—may probably have felt that there was some compensation for the abolition of a body which had not become the true organ of national life in the increased moral influence acquired by the general assembly of the Church, through its becoming more truly than ever the one representative body of the nation. The result of the respect paid to Scotch institutions was that while Scotland became an inseparable part of Great Britain, Scotch affairs remained after, even more than before, the Union under the complete control of Scotchmen. Scotland was never more independent (if to be left alone be independence) than when she had ceased to be a separate country. A Scotch farmer or a Scotch minister soon felt that the Union had made no change except a change for the better. The courts, the law, the church, remained as they were, but every man throughout the country shared in the prosperity of the British Empire. What is worth notice because it is apt to be forgotten is, that the wisest of unions produced incidental evils which, under less favourable circumstances, might have been serious. Scotch political life dwindled to nothing; Scotland became

a pocket borough of the ministry in power in England, till at last such a man as Dundas became the tyrant of the country. Abuses went unreformed, till in 1830 the whole country was all but ready for revolution. This was the price to Scotland of a system which, as Malachi Malagrowther taught a Tory Government, made even a dirty Scotch one pound note too sacred to be touched by the reforming hands of the Imperial Parliament. Nor did England escape wholly from damage. The Scotch members were George the III.'s parliamentary body-guard, and we all know what were the ends for which George's parliamentary forces were in the main employed.

In their ecclesiastical arrangements, and indeed in their whole mode of dealing with Irish institutions, Pitt and his colleagues followed the letter and violated the spirit of precedent, set them by the statesmen of the Revolution. The Church of Scotland was made secure by the union with England, so also was the Church of Ireland; but the church strengthened by Godolphin was the church of the Scotch people, whilst the church for the security of which Pitt provided was not the church of the Irish people. In each case a Parliament was abolished, but the destruction of the Parliament which met on College Green was a very different thing at bottom than the destruction of the Parliament which met in Edinburgh. The merits and the vices alike of the Irish Parliament have (impartial students may conjecture) been the subject of much rhetorical exaggeration. The assembly which sat in Dublin had, what the Scotch Parliament had not, strong claims on the sentimental interests of the people whom it represented; it had vindicated national independence; it had freed Irish commerce; it had produced within the twenty years preceding its death a brilliant body of statesmen and orators; it had become in short a centre of national life. To destroy such a centre was no light matter. The destruction further of local political life, which is almost inseparable from schemes of national consolidation, was a far greater evil in Ireland than in Scotland, for politics had been with the Irish what they were not with the Scotch, the main sphere for the display and training of native genius. Nor was political amalgamation with the United Kingdom compensated for by local independence. Ireland since as before the Union has been governed in the main in accordance with English notions, applied in many cases or misapplied by English officials. A trifling fact proves more than pages of argument. It is not much more than thirty years since Lord Campbell ousted from the Irish Chancellorship the Irishman who beyond all others had a moral claim to the place. The transaction excited indeed some comment, but was soon as far as the English public were concerned forgotten. What would Englishmen or Scotchmen think of the sanity of a Premier who promoted the most learned of English lawyers to the presidency of the Court of Session? "Does an Union

under such circumstances by free consent and on just and equal terms deserve to be branded as proposal for subjecting Ireland to a foreign yoke? Is it not rather a free and voluntary association of two great countries which join for their common benefit in one empire, where each will retain its proportional weight and importance under the security of equal laws, reciprocal affection, and inseparable interests, which want nothing but that indissoluble connection to render both invincible?" Change but one word, and this passage might still stand as a noble and deserved tribute to the merits and success of the policy of 1706. Read as what it is—a portion of the elaborate oration in which Pitt vindicated the Union with Ireland—the passage which convinced and charmed the great ministers' hearers now sounds like the bitterest satire on his policy and his work. The fact that words which precisely apply to the Union with Scotland cannot now, except with bitter irony, be applied to the Union with Ireland, tells clearly enough how things stand. A comparison of the two great transactions shows that the success of the Union with Scotland, no less than the failure or partial failure of the Union with Ireland, are each the result of natural, known, and assignable causes. Neither Scotch nor Irish history can, except by the most perverse misreading of past events, be forced into teaching the lesson that the failure of the policy in Ireland is due to the peculiarities of Irish character. It is vain to attribute to the special characteristics of any people consequences which can be explained by the neglect on the part of statesmen to make their policy conform to the nature of things.

If the lesson generally deduced from a comparison between Scotch and Irish history is one which ought to be noticed only to be unlearned, there is teaching to be drawn from one portion of the history of Scotland well deserving the careful consideration of persons who wish to understand the relation between England and Ireland. From the accession of James I. (1603) to the Union (1706), Scotland was, though theoretically independent, in fact in a condition of partial dependence on the English Crown, and throughout the period of about a century every English Government in succession attempted with more or less vigour to govern the northern part of the island on English principles. James was fully convinced, and from his own point of view not without reason, of the truth of the maxim, "No Bishop, no King." His son, with far more zeal than James and not half the sagacity of his father, was bent under the guidance of Laud on giving effect to episcopalian principles. His attempt to force ecclesiastical innovations on Scotland drove the country to rebellion. Cromwell and Charles had little in common, but Cromwell, like Charles, was an English ruler, and when he got the chance strove with far more vigour and infinitely greater success than the King to make the Scotch accept his notions (and very good notions too in their way) of the mode in which their country should be governed.

By far the truest historical parallel to the Irish Union is the incorporation with England which Cromwell imposed by force of arms on Scotland. Looked at in itself, the measure was a much better one than the Act of Union passed by Pitt. If any scheme could be called wise and good which is opposed to the nature of things and overlooks the prejudices of the people to whom it is intended to be applied, Cromwell's Scotch legislation would well deserve to be called both wise and good. He gave the Scotch people the best administration they had up to his time ever possessed. He opened to them the benefit of free trade. "There was," says Burton, "a theoretical discontent, a latent protestation against the whole arrangement, and a loyal desire to see Charles II. restored. But it had little active vitality, and perhaps it was in human nature that the material prosperity of the people soothed such political irritation as came of mere abstract principles, and preserved the general lull." The people it might be thought had not any great cause for discontent. Cromwell's policy had but one defect. It was opposed to every sentiment and prejudice of the Scotch people; it fell of itself amidst the delirious joy of the whole country. Of Charles II.'s dealing with Scotland it is unnecessary to say anything. Readers of *Old Mortality* know pretty well in a general way what were the results of his Majesty's religious concern for the welfare or the religion of his Scotch subjects.

The Revolution, though it changed the Government in England and Scotland, did not bring such an essential change of spirit as might have been expected. In both parts of Great Britain passion for trade was superseding zeal for religion. The Restoration had deprived the Scotch of the advantages of union, and the mercantile legislation of the Commonwealth as applied to a disunited country was deadly to Scotch commerce. The mention of the African Company, the Darien scheme, and the murder of Captain Green still recalls a state of things bearing a curious resemblance to the condition of Ireland between 1778 and 1800. The point to be carefully noted is the effect of English interference on Scotch sentiment; for the lesson of the seventeenth century is not only that England acted towards Scotland in a spirit similar to the spirit displayed towards Ireland, but that the same faults produced in both cases the same evils. An English statesman of 1706 would, we suspect, have considered the Scotch at least as difficult to manage as the Irish. Oppression and interference produced in Scotland, as it produces everywhere, lawlessness and unreasonableness. An Englishman might well enough argue that the Scotch were irreconcilable. They revolted against Charles I. and betrayed him, they were indignant at Charles's execution, rallied round Charles's son, and attempted to strike a fatal blow at English policy. They hated the good government of Cromwell, they were delirious with joy at the Restoration, yet they were soon again in arms against Charles II. They were not con-

tented under the government of William. Under the rule of Anne they passed laws intended to undo all the good which had resulted from the union of the crowns of England and Scotland, on the head of one person. If you wished, it might be said, to see a specimen of Scotch cruelty, treachery, suspicion, prejudice, and folly, you should reflect upon the murder of Captain Green. Even now this forgotten transaction is well worth thoughtful study by any one who wants to know what are the follies and cruelties into which a sensible people may be led by offence to national self-love or national interest. The main features of the transaction may be easily summed up. The failure of the Darien scheme had, in 1703 and 1704, been much more than a mercantile calamity. It made every Scotchman feel that ~~Scotch~~ independence was nothing but a name, and led hundreds of Scotchmen to believe, not entirely without reason, that an undertaking in which the credit and interest of their country was concerned had been sacrificed to the selfishness and to the cupidity of England. Under these circumstances an English ship belonging to an English company and connected with the East India trade arrived at Leith. Whether Captain Green and the crew of the *Worcester* had committed any crime whatever is most uncertain; there never was adduced a single fact to prove that any man on board that ship had even injured a single Scotchman; that Captain Green had not killed the Scotchman he was supposed to have murdered is absolutely certain. Yet, somehow or other, no one knows how, the rumour got abroad that the Captain and his crew were a gang of pirates, who had murdered one Captain Drummond and other Scotchmen. The ship was seized by the officers of the Scotch African Company with circumstances of deliberate treachery which recall the massacre of Glencoe. Green and his men were dragged to trial in deference to the wishes of the Scotch mob. They were tried by Scotch judges, convicted by a Scotch jury, and, though innocent of any proved crime, were executed by order of the Scotch Privy Council in defiance of the wishes of the Crown; and if they had not been put to death by the executioner would doubtless have been hanged, as was Porteus, a generation later, by the citizens of Edinburgh. The plain truth is that, under the rule of Queen Anne, Green and two of his crew were the victims of Scotch animosity to England, and were sacrificed to a "Scotch idea" fully as brutal and fully as irrational as any of the notions which Mr. Froude has been pleased to brand with the name of Irish ideas.

There is no need to press the moral of a forgotten chapter in history. What is worth notice, because it has some bearing on the solution of existing political problems, is that Scotch history before, at, and since the Union shows, not that just policy produces one effect in Ireland and another in Scotland, but that in each country justice and injustice produce each of them its natural fruits.

A. V. DICEY.

THE MORAL COLOUR OF RATIONALISM.

ONE continually meets with persons who, seeming to give intellectual assent to the leading scientific hypothesis of our time, yet deeply mistrust what they conceive to be its moral implications, and who, as a consequence, are reduced to a chaotic condition of opinion, precluding them from taking any cause frankly to heart, or from carrying any theory firmly in the head. It would save a good deal of fruitless discussion if thinkers who find themselves in this uncomfortable ethical predicament would refrain from eloquence until they have given the body of their convictions time to range themselves on one side or the other. But this is the last thing it occurs to them to do. With no apparent ideal to uphold, and with no distinct advice to offer, they yet have quite a noisy literature of their own, and many forcible exponents of their somewhat futile distresses. Such prophets prophesy unto us things the reverse of smooth. They generally begin by admitting, or implying, more or less dejectedly, that the voice of science has to be listened to, as on the whole the most credible voice within earshot of this century. Then, having made this admission, they commonly proceed to dilate on the prospective misery and degeneration such listening will bring upon our ill-fated race.

To one essayist whose writings at least tend in the direction I have indicated, it is my purpose in this paper definitely to reply. Mr. Goldwin Smith has within the past four or five years published several essays, the apparent object of which has been to exhibit the moral shortcomings of scientific philosophy. While nothing that he says leads one to suppose that he considers the objective grounds of the evolution doctrine invalid, his thesis is that the code of ethics he conceives to be suggested and supported by it is certain to prove generally detrimental; and that it in particular negatives the legitimacy of the belief in "human brotherhood," the spread of humane feeling, and the protection of the interests of weaker races against the selfishness of the stronger.

I propose to deal with Mr. Goldwin Smith's arguments in a two-fold manner. In the first place to point out how his thesis displays a misconception of the ethical tenets of the evolutionists, and by implication a misconception of the fundamental theory of development itself; in the second, to refute the specific charges advanced in his essays concerning certain recent political and colonial doings cited by him in illustration of that thesis. I believe it may be shown that rationalists in general and that evolutionists in particular are, in the

practical apportioning of their sympathies and their aid, as a body relatively more humane than the orthodox section of the community ; that it follows from their theory they *should* be, and that in fact they are so displayed.

I have before me three of Mr. Goldwin Smith's essays. The first is entitled *The Ascent of Man*.¹ The second is written in depreciation of *The Proposed Substitutes for Religion*.² The third is on *The Prospect of a Moral Interregnum*.³ In each of these three papers, and also I am told in detached passages elsewhere in what he has written, the charge brought against scientific doctrine, and variously enforced by argument, is that it tends to give a charter to personal and political selfishness and tyranny. And in each article the author brings forward as among conspicuous examples of the kind of harm that evolutional and positivist conviction has already begun to work, the state of public feeling in England as shown in the "Eyre Defence" agitation, at the time of the Jamaica insurrection.

I. The *Ascent of Man*⁴ opens with certain ethical admissions favourable rather than not to the evolution hypothesis. But in succeeding pages we find advanced the rather curious complaint—that evolutionists are unreasonably prone to overlook the facts of human development, and to disregard the probability that further development awaits our race in time to come. Here are the words :—

"There seems to be (among evolutionists) a tendency . . . to treat the origin of a being as finally decisive of its nature and destiny. . . . An eminent writer on the antiquities of jurisprudence intimates his belief that the idea of human brotherhood is not coeval with the race, and that primitive communities were governed by sentiments of a very different kind. His words are at once pounced upon as a warrant for dismissing the idea of human brotherhood from our minds, and substituting for it some other social principle the character of which. . . is beginning in some quarters pretty distinctly to appear."

(One would be glad at this point, for sake of clearness, to be told who is the writer on jurisprudence, and which are the evolutionists who "pounce upon" his words. Mr. Goldwin Smith leaves his reader in the dark as to these particulars ; and continues—)

"But surely this is not reasonable. There can be no reason why the first estate of man, which all allow to have been his lowest estate, should claim the prerogative of furnishing his only real and indefeasible principles of action. Granting that the idea of human brotherhood was not aboriginal, granting that it came into the world at a comparatively late period, still it has come ; and having come, it is as real, and seems as much entitled to consideration, as inter-tribal hostility and domestic despotism were in their own day."

Here our essayist beats the air. If there is a theory which more than any other holds of account not only every variation, but every

(1) *Macmillan's Magazine*, January, 1877.

(2) *Ibid.*, February, 1878.

(3) *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1879.

(4) *Macmillan's Magazine*, January, 1877 (p. 191).

detail of every variation in the summing of its conclusions, it is the evolution theory. Not a change, however apparently trifling, not a condition, however apparently accidental, not a factor, however apparently insignificant, but is noted by that theory as soon as it appears, and never lost sight of again, as contributing in increasingly complex ways to the increasing complexity of the phenomena under observation. At no two moments, according to the evolution hypothesis, can the universe or any of its constituent parts and processes be said to be in direct causal line, either with original antecedents, or with ultimate consequents. As Emerson somewhere says, "everything in the universe goes by indirection;" and the office of the evolutionist is to discern the precise kind of indirection in which things move, and to note the relations which are common to them at every point, as rules or "laws," for the further conduct of our conceptions and expectations.

As to evolutionary teaching with regard to the special matter of moral development, we may here fitly quote the words of Mr. Herbert Spencer, as offering a curious contrast to the doctrine imputed by Mr. Goldwin Smith to evolutionists. In his *Appendix to the Data of Ethics*, Mr. Spencer remarks as follows:—

"So far is it from being true, as might be supposed from the general incredulity, that though there has arisen a considerable moralisation of the human being as a concomitant of civilisation, there will be no comparable increase of such moralisation in the future, it is true that *the moralisation will hereafter go on at a much greater rate*, because it will no longer be checked by influences hitherto and at present in operation. During all the past, and even still, the need for maintaining adaptation to the militant life, which implies readiness to sacrifice others, has perpetually held in check the progress of adaptation to the industrial life which, carried on by exchange of services, does not of necessity entail the sacrifice of others to self."

Again:—

"Not only must we infer that the future of man and of society will have modifications as great as the past has shown us, but that *it will have much greater*. That is to say, that the transformation of altruistic gratifications into egoistic ones will be carried very much further; and an average larger share in the happiness of each individual will depend on consciousness of the well-being of other individuals" (pp. 298—9).

In face, indeed, of the profound but orderly complexity of natural development, as perceived and taught by modern philosophy, the words of Mr. Goldwin Smith fall very wide of their mark—

"Supposing (he says,) ¹ the account of the origin of the moral sense and of moral life given in the *Descent of Man* to be true, it is an account of the origin only. . . . It is not more significant compared with the subsequent development than is the origin of physical life compared with the subsequent history of living beings. . . . Between the origin of moral life and its present manifestations has intervened something so considerable as to baffle any anticipation of the destiny of humanity which could have been formed from a mere inspec-

(1) *Macmillan's Magazine*, January, 1877 (p. 197).

tion of the rudiments. Whatever things may have been in their origin, they are what they are, both in themselves and in regard to their indications respecting other beings or influences, the existence of which may be implied in theirs. . . . A physiologist sets before us a set of plates showing the similarity between the embryo of Newton and that of his dog Diamond. *The inference which he probably expects us to draw is that there is no essential difference between the philosopher and the dog.*"

Contrast with this quotation the following passage. In Mr. G. H. Lewes's *Study of Psychology* (p. 147) we read—

"We may fitly look backwards and see how short a way the consideration of animal life alone will take us in the appreciation of the moral life of mankind, which is wrought out of innumerable closely-woven threads of feeling and knowing."

Again (p. 153):—

"Because psychology is interpreted through sociology, and experience acquires its development mainly through social influences, we must always take history into account. . . . The physiologist recognises the same organs and functions in the savage and the civilised, but not the same thoughts and sentiments. The brain of a cultivated Englishman of our day compared with the brain of a Greek of the age of Pericles would not present any appreciable differences; yet the differences between the moral and intellectual activities of the two would be many and vast. *These are not to be assigned to the organism and its functions.* . . . The Englishman has been nourished on the products of the centuries, his feelings and thoughts have taken form under conditions unknown to the Greek, so that what would have delighted the one is anguish to the other. The sight of a wounded foreigner, which agitates the Englishman, and prompts him by its very imagination to undertake hardship and danger in the effort to relieve the sufferer, would have excited no more emotion in a Greek than the sight of an injured dog."

With such inaccurate reading before us as Mr. Goldwin Smith's words present of the evolution doctrine, it appears, indeed, almost futile to attempt serious criticism or argument. For we find that a school which in its teaching insists upon the subtlety, multiplicity, and constant flux of relations, and the continuity of causation, is virtually credited with postulating a fixed rigidity of relation, and, by implication, with ignoring the re-formative action of ceaseless changes.

Mr. Goldwin Smith having, in his interpretation of its principle, thus precisely reversed the meaning of the theory he assails, further somewhat inconsistently calls upon evolution—

"To be true to itself, and to recognise the possibility of development in the future, as well as the fact of the development of the past."

"The series of developments has proceeded from the inorganic to the organic, from the organic upwards to moral and intellectual life. Why should it be arrested there? Why should it not continue its upward course, and arrive at a development which might be designated as spiritual life?"

We need not affect to misunderstand this. Mr. Goldwin Smith likes the theory of past development well enough to wish to build, so to speak, a scientific "heavenly hope" upon it. He would fain have evolutionists class among the corollaries of their theory the likelihood

of "spiritual" development of immortal individuals out of the human race as at present existing. His hardly tacit contention seems to be this—"Why, since brutes have become men, should not you and I become something as unlike and superior to men, as men are unlike and superior to brutes?" He overlooks the fact that developmental changes of such magnitude have, as found in nature, and as taught by science, a hereditary rather than an individual history. No individual brute has ever become a man; and the fact that a brute (which, living and dying a brute, yet) after the lapse of countless generations has a human posterity, affords no ground for supposing that a change similar in amount is to be effected within the limit of any individual life. Failing to discriminate between these two notions of development, Mr. Goldwin Smith is impatient at the small room left by the evolution doctrine for the spread and flutter of angelic wings.

But setting this aside, may we not in return call upon him to point to a single instance of an evolutionary teacher who considers either that "there is no essential difference between a philosopher and a dog;" or that nothing "considerable" has "intervened" since moral development began; or that man's race has already exhausted all possibility of further and increasingly progressive development? Does not the whole of this strange protest indicate on the part of any one who makes it a most inadequate conception of evolution, and a most superficial study of its principles, whether as set forth by its leading exponents or as exhibited in phenomena?

In its ethical teaching, science never loses sight of the fact that man is what a long, complicated, and changeeful history has brought him to be. And although the truth that he was what he was at the commencement of that history is also kept in view (since it at once affords a helpful index to the direction in which progress is taking place, and a clue for the direction of further voluntary effort), yet, since the operation of various ascertainable influences has made him so superior a being to the primitive barbarian from whom he descends (or, to use Mr. Goldwin Smith's amended expression, 'ascends'), duty is but the more clearly seen to lie in the continuous use and encouragement of those civilising influences, the deepest and surest of which in our hands to-day is civilisation itself, in the shape of so much sympathy and humane aspiration as is found in our own hearts. In point of fact, while sociology offers explanation of the anti-social tendencies still left in individuals, by regarding them as surviving remnants of inherited brutality, it implicitly condemns them *by that very explanation* as unsuited to the vastly changed external conditions of human existence. Sociologically viewed, such tendencies are, among ourselves, unfit. Ethically viewed, therefore, they are hurtful, inhuman, wrong.

The brute force in exercise of which lay the primitive man's only chance of survival, was once his only moral tool; or rather, was the pre-moral agency which brought him far enough along his difficult course to reach moral beginnings. But brute force as a best means is superseded from the day on which barbarians find it possible and advantageous to effect peaceful exchange of goods or services. From that day forward it takes a second place of ever-decreasing utility, and of ever-decreasing rightfulness. And thus the charge brought by Mr. Goldwin Smith against evolutionists, that their belief in ancestral fierceness implies a belief in the continued necessity of such fierceness for bending one another's wills, is about as much to the point as would be a charge that evolutionists are wont to recommend the exclusive use of chipped flints, and to decry the adoption of more complex means for bending the forces of nature to their wills, only because chipped flints were the original tools of a race that has since invented the steam-engine and the telescope.

But not only does Mr. Goldwin Smith thus misconstrue the positive side of scientific ethics; he further maintains that the negative attitude of science towards the tenets of current European orthodoxy should, in consistency, involve also a negative attitude towards the belief in "human brotherhood," and in its implied code of duties. He couples with evolutionary teaching the positivism of Comte, and accounts the sympathy with humanity upheld by evolutionists, and the worship of humanity taught by Comtists, alike preposterous.

"After all, without God or spirit, what (he asks) is Humanity? One school of science reckons one hundred and fifty different species of man. What is the bond of unity between these species, and wherein consists the obligation to mutual love and help?"

Again:—

"Humanity, it seems to us, is a fundamentally Christian idea. . . . The idea of the progress of Humanity seems to us to have been derived from the Christian belief in the coming of the kingdom of God through the extension of the Church."

To these quotations one is tempted to retort by use of that very argument of Mr. Goldwin Smith's which we have just been considering: namely, that whether man had this origin or that is not the question, since he is what he is, here and now; and that be the matrix of the *conscious belief* in human progress never so much the Christian Church, yet that our present business is not with origins and past facts, but with present possibilities and future developments.

But, in truth, a more serious reply suggests itself. This very doctrine of human brotherhood as upheld by orthodoxy it is which is theoretically arbitrary, and therefore practically ricketty, rather than the same doctrine as upheld by evolutionists. For the doctrine

that men are "one in Christ" tells merely of the bond of a common faith supposed eventually to be shared by all men alike. All its force hinges on the possession of convictions respecting an after-life—convictions which every advance of real knowledge, whether biological or psychological, tends indirectly rather to weaken than to reinforce. Such a doctrine implies that men's duty of mutual helpfulness is derived from a single teacher's injunctions; and that they are to feel and to act as "brothers," not because of the simple, natural fact that they are knit by their common needs, and mutual powers of helpfulness, but because one large-hearted, heretical Jewish artisan but yesterday was, by a section of humanity, declared a god, or a demi-god; and but yesterday, in that character, imposed the notion of the unity of humanity, declaring that all the slight varieties of men he knew of should love one another "for his sake." Needless to say that this limited idea of the obligation of "brotherhood" is an idea likely enough to be transcended.

I maintain, in effect, that in these days, when orthodoxy is obliged to confront scientific facts, our lowlier fellow-men run more chance of losing the practical sympathy of their theological "brothers" whose theory they so wofully strain, than of losing the sympathy of their evolutionary "brothers" whose theory they, in their very lowliness, support. Surely, if the theory of human unity, in this world or another, depends in any degree on the possibility of bringing all men's souls into harmony on matters of doctrine and faith, it becomes a hopeless ideal, alike in face of the semi-brutish barbarians who baffle all attempts at "spiritual" approach or communion, and of those very different other tribes who, we are told, display more than Christian virtues, while possessing no idea of a God or of immortality.

No; if in the face of scientific ascendancy we are to look for a decrease of humane sentiment and of equitable dealing, we must look for it among those who, themselves unable or unaccustomed to grasp the evolutionary ideal, yet feel evolutionary influence to be working havoc among their own doctrines. And this is precisely what we do find. From the orthodox or the semi-orthodox come all the querulous misgivings as to the natural foundations of duty; all the assertions that the reasonableness of selfish license and selfish tyranny begins to appear. Orthodoxy it is which in our time *has* reason to feel its own moral ground shaking under its feet, and consequently orthodoxy it is which, at any critical juncture, loses alike its faith in principle, and its hope in patience, and falls into action that is intemperate, national, sectarian, inhumane.

Recent history affords, we think, as many examples in this connection, as Mr. Goldwin Smith believes it to afford in the opposite

one. Indeed, the very cases he quotes, if fairly examined, not only admit of, but suggest, a reading the exact reverse of his own.

II. Having so far noticed Mr. Smith's evident misappreciation of the theoretical drift of evolutionary moral teaching, let us now observe the strangely-selected data he calls in aid of his thesis. In the essay entitled *The Prospect of a Moral Interregnum*,¹ he is even more minutely explicit than in the two former essays, in reference to what he regards as the evil effects of evolutionary belief. He gives the reader several pages of historical illustration, and one or two quotations of opinion, as bearing on his gospel of despair. It is remarkable that none of these quotations are from the works of leading men of science; but are the opinions of persons mostly unnamed. In the two or three instances where names are given, the selected opinions are those of persons not commonly credited with paramount scientific authority, but into whose views Mr. Goldwin Smith appears somewhat arbitrarily to have read evolutionism for the purpose of taking it out again ethically besmirched, and reeking with the blood of the weaker peoples. Among the authorities quoted are Napoleon I., Lord Beaconsfield, Sir Henry Elliott, and M. Thiers.

Having affirmed that an "incipient change of principle . . . is perceptible [in] the sentiment and conduct of England as an imperial country towards weaker communities and subject races," he continues—

"Nobody in the time of Wilberforce would have dared to avow that the rule in dealing with a Hindoo or an African was not to be equity, humanity, or respect for human life; but British interest and the requirements of British policy. . . . The slave trade, and afterwards slavery were abolished. . . . [and] had the same sentiment continued to prevail it is not inconceivable that conquest itself might have been relinquished as radically inconsistent with the rule of humanity and benevolence."

(Here, did space permit, we might fittingly inquire in detail by whom it is that this hope is now relinquished, and what section it is of the thinking world who on the contrary continue to cling to it.)

That the same sentiment has at any rate not continued to prevail Mr. Smith considers was evidenced at the time of the American civil war, when the "denunciation of *negrophilism* which resounded on all sides denoted not merely antipathy to Northern aggrandisement . . . but dislike of [slave] emancipation."

And again,—

"Moral phenomena of the same kind marked the controversy arising out of the Jamaica massacre, for the enthusiastic supporters of Governor Eyre perfectly recognised in him one organ of the sanguinary vengeance of the dominant race, even if they did not believe that he had committed a foul judicial murder." [In this controversy] "we had proof enough that the ascendancy

(1) *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1879 (p. 638).

of science and a strong sense of human brotherhood might be very different things."

Before passing to the enumeration of the further British atrocities quoted as instances of the injury that scientific doctrine is doing to the political conscience of our own nation, it will be interesting to pause at this particular example of the Jamaica controversy, upon which (since he names it in essay after essay) Mr. Goldwin Smith evidently relies a good deal for the establishment of his point. Not that he indeed attempts any precise demonstration that the unjust cruelties committed in 1865 by a British governor, and defended by a certain proportion of British subjects, were in any definite manner associated with the holding of rationalist or evolutionist conviction. Such a demonstration would have been very hard to extract from the facts of the case. Had the perpetrators of such injustice, or its argumentative defenders been conspicuous rationalists, or even in all cases members of that political section of the community in which rationalists are most numerous, some colour might have been given to Mr. Goldwin Smith's allegations. But the very reverse of this was markedly the case, as the reader shall presently be reminded in detail.

Meanwhile, in the absence of any distinct reasons advanced by our author for connecting the events he deplures with the opinions he mistrusts, we are reduced to accounting for his conclusion on the mere ground that the Jamaica scandal, as well as various other ferocities committed under British rule and commanding a large amount of British applause, have occurred since the evolution doctrine was broached. The argument as an argument is exceedingly absurd, a glaring case of *post hoc, propter hoc*. As well might be associated with the spread of the evolutionary doctrine the merciful action of British sympathy at the time of the Franco-German war, when our nation was astir with effort to mitigate the sufferings of the wounded in both armies. The probability is that in neither case was public feeling very definitely associated with theory, either scientific or orthodox. But if one had to choose between these two cases—of inhumane stirring in 1866, and of humane stirring in 1870—as to which was most consonant with evolutionary principle as held by evolutionists themselves, one must undoubtedly choose the latter.

Beyond its logical absurdity, however, a graver charge must be brought against the persistent citation of the Jamaica business in support of anti-scientific theory. The facts as presented in Mr. Goldwin Smith's essays seem to yield very different inferences from the facts as they actually occurred. I have before me the list of the members of the *Jamaica Committee*, whose object, it will be remembered, was to procure the prosecution of the unfit governor, whose

impetuous and ill-considered mode of dealing with the negro insurrection, and whose injustice in the execution of Mr. Gordon called forth the indignation of Englishmen at home, and fired their sympathies in favour of the weaker and half-barbarous rebels. The list of the General Committee is remarkable as including the names of most of the leading English rationalists—men whose theory either excludes or ignores precisely those moral sanctions and authorities Mr. Goldwin Smith deems most necessary to the support of humane principle. The chairman was Mr. John Stuart Mill, and the list contains, of conspicuous evolutionists, the names of Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Lyell, and Bain; and of positivists, who equally come under the scope of Mr. Goldwin Smith's charge, the names of Frederic Harrison, Beesly, Congreve, and others.

Still more striking is the list of members of the Executive Committee. Of these, numbering altogether thirty, there are at least eight names of the rationalist class, and of these most took very conspicuous parts in the action of the committee.

There are meanwhile relatively few names of professional religionists on this committee; and among such as there are, I note chiefly those of unitarian and other unorthodox leaders of what calls itself "religious free-thought;" witnessing still to the tendency of modern rationalism, in whatever degree it exists, to enlist itself on the side of equity and humanity. The significant fact, in short, was, that the number of evolutionists on the committee bore a far higher ratio to the evolutionists in the community than did the number of Christians on the committee to the Christians in the community. Finally, of political sects, the greater balance of sympathetic feeling on behalf of the negro population of Jamaica, and the lesser tendency to subordinate the idea of its interests to that of British ascendancy, was undoubtedly evidenced by Liberals, among whose ranks it needs not saying that science and rationalism are more usually found than among the Conservatives.

Since Mr. Goldwin Smith's own name is on the executive part of the Jamaica Committee, and since the composition and the operation of the committee were alike well known to him, it is the more singular that so much adverse evidence should not have deterred him from repeatedly using the Jamaica controversy as favouring his allegation respecting scientific inhumanity. A half apologetic paragraph does indeed occur in one of his essays, in which he "gratefully remembers that among the foremost champions of humanity on that occasion stood some men of the highest eminence who are generally classed with the ultra-scientific school; but (he adds) they were men in whose philosophy we are persuaded an essentially theological element still lingers, however untheological the language of some of them may be."

This persuasion of Mr. Goldwin Smith's respecting the assumed theological leanings of scientific leaders is, however, based on pure hypothesis, and is backed by no particle of evidence. And even were the fact as he alleges, there would be disclosed the remarkable anomaly that whereas the class of men who not only have been brought up under the old theology, but who still adhere to it, showed on this and many similar occasions relatively little humanity, relatively much humanity was shown by those who, brought up under it, have abandoned it. That is to say, the effect of the alleged cause is the greatest where the cause has ceased to be in operation. Those on whom it continues to act show less of its effect than those on whom it long ago ceased to act. Had the Roman Catholics suggested when Protestantism arose that such virtues as Protestants displayed were due to the continuance of Roman Catholic discipline, it would have been quite as valid an allegation as that contained in this hypothesis of Mr. Goldwin Smith.

Before leaving the subject of the Jamaica controversy, it may be interesting to note the marked contrast displayed between the *Jamaica Committee*, and the *Eyre Defence Committee* whose object was to oppose the proceedings against Governor Eyre. What were the principles, and who were the strength of this antagonistic league? An unbiassed reader of Mr. Goldwin Smith's essays, approaching the matter for the first time, would expect to find science largely represented among its members, and Christianity utterly shut out. On the contrary, orthodox science-haters and heterodox science-haters met together in unanimity of ire against the Jamaica Committee, and in resolve to defend the inhumane conduct of the Ex-Governor. The *Eyre Defence Committee* was headed by Carlyle, who was not only a scorner of science and a ridiculer of evolutionist doctrine, but also most explicitly a disbeliever in the obligation of British rulers to deal sympathetically with subject races; and who, at the time of the agitation in question, wrote down the indignation then deeply stirring the gentler hearts of the community in behalf of the negroes, as "disgraceful," "blind," and "egregious folly." This position was of course perfectly consistent with Carlyle's general teaching, and with that anti-scientific spirit which is ever apt to advocate, at a difficult crisis, rough and immediate measures, rather than to trust to long-sighted or patient means for the accomplishment (so far as immediate fair play admits) of an obviously desirable end.

In the letter written by Carlyle, in October, 1866, to the Secretary of the *Eyre Defence Committee*, he remarks that—

"If the clamour raised against Governor Eyre could be supposed to rest on any depth of conviction, and were not rather a thing of repetition and reverberation, mostly from the teeth outwards, [he] should consider it of evil omen to the country and to its highest (*sic*) interests in these times." . . .

"None can say or compute what a vital detriment throughout the British empire is in such an example [as that afforded by the exertions of the Jamaica committee] set to all the colonies and governors the British empire has."

Further particulars respecting the *Eyre Defence Committee* have interest, as bearing indirectly upon the opinion we are maintaining—that a relatively deficient sensitiveness to the feelings and interests of other races and of other classes is bound up with that conservatism of feeling of which the natural obverse is more or less orthodoxy in opinion. A conspicuous feature was the large number of clerical names included in the committee-list, as also of other (largely aristocratic) names identified directly and indirectly with the maintenance of the current creed. Meanwhile, there was but one evolutionist on the committee; so that the immense predominance of anti-evolution opinion was a trait of the *Eyre Defence Committee*, as remarkable as was the converse a trait of the opposing committee. Any one who wanted facts showing the connection between evolutionism and humanity could not find more striking ones than those furnished by this Jamaica business, which Mr. Goldwin Smith names as showing the connection between evolutionism and inhumanity.

As further illustrating the same relative tendency, may be noted on the list of subscribers to the "Eyre Defence Fund" sundry anonymous donors who, with their contribution, sent in their reasons for subscribing. Here are some of them:—

1. "One whose sister was massacred at Cawnpore." (Here we have apparent vindictiveness against the negro for the misdeed of the Hindoo. One dark skin is to reap the penalty due to another dark skin.)

2. "One who detests the principles of Bright, Gladstone, and Russell." (This speaks eloquently for itself.)

3. "One who perceives the necessity of firmness and vigour in those in authority." (But overlooks apparently the more abiding necessity of patience and equity.)

4. "A lady who has suffered by the Jamaica insurrection, and believes Governor Eyre has saved Jamaica to his ungrateful country." (Personal retaliation, tinged by territorial feeling.)

It would be unfair to quote these individual examples as indicative of the feeling generally at work among the defenders of Eyre's "Black Policy," were there elsewhere any evidence of larger feeling having prompted that defence. In the total absence of such evidence, however, these pitiful published confessions may well stand as, so far, confirmatory of the charge of relative inhumanity here maintained against average orthodoxy. Whereas the principle which the scientific sections of the community invariably gave as ground for their sympathy with the negroes was simply that of merciful fair-play, the principle leant upon by the Eyre Defence

agitators took uniformly the lower and narrower ethical ground of "British interests" in one shape or another. Examples have not been wanting in later years, similarly illustrative of the Conservative tendency to ridicule as preposterous in matters of foreign and social policy any practical application of the belief in human brotherhood. Orthodox Conservatism is inclined to keep its theory of world-wide humanity for its wife and children to listen to, duly couched in Jewish phraseology, on Sunday. It seldom evinces a frank belief in it as a sound principle for nations to live by, and shows hesitation to countenance it as the basis of any large political measures. It is in the opposite camp that we oftenest find men boldly trusting in "human brotherhood" as in the main a sound workaday principle; even to the extent of hazarding its immediately-disadvantageous political issues. There are exceptions on both sides, of course; but the relative balance of feeling exists as here indicated.

There is, we say, abundant evidence. Mr. Goldwin Smith, however, filches for his own theory exactly such instances as appear to us to tell most strongly against that theory. He cites the injustice of British arms in Afghanistan, and British cruelties in Zululand, as alike the offspring of scientific belief. Writing in 1879, during the ministry of Lord Beaconsfield, he remarks respecting the first:—

"It is now avowed by the Prime Minister of England that the real object of the [Afghan] war was a scientific frontier, and that Afghanistan was invaded, the villages burned, and the people killed in execution of that policy."

Are we to infer from this passage that to Lord Beaconsfield and his party—that is, to the main body of English Conservatism and its concomitant English orthodoxy—we should look for the most consistent exhibition of the very doctrine of which that party contains the leading repudiators? Was it science truly so-called, or "science falsely so-called," that thus claimed a frontier for our territory at the expense of international sympathy and of equity? If Lord Beaconsfield's view of the matter was the scientific one, what was that of Mr. Frederic Harrison, who, in his stirring papers on "Martial Law in Kabul," entered earnest protest against our Afghan misdoings?

"By what title (asks Mr. Harrison) [is it that we are] treating the Afghan people as rebels? By what law are our generals hanging men on charge of leading the enemy's forces to battle? And whence comes our right to kill priests who incite their people to resist us?"

The protest concludes with an indignant declaration that we will never accept the English crown as that of a "lawless, conquering, blood-stained Empire."

As to the cruelties in Zululand, Mr. Goldwin Smith makes much

of the opportunity taken by an English illustrated journal to create fun for us at home by depicting the bodily tortures of Zulu prisoners in the hands of British tars.

"It may (he says) pretty safely be said that these pictures, in which the inferior races are treated simply as game for the British hunter, would not have been produced for the amusement of Englishmen fifty, or even thirty years ago; and that their appearance now denotes a change in the mind of the nation."¹

Once more the question is unavoidable. Why, in the alleged existence of a causal connection between modern British philosophy and modern British cruelty, do the cruelty and the philosophy show such a perverse tendency to appear apart, and to repudiate one another?

That of late years there has been a lamentable return on the part of England to violent and predatory dealings with weaker peoples we are all too well aware. But, so far from such dealings having arisen out of, or been supported by, science, it cannot be too often repeated that we find the whole weight of scientific sympathies thrown into resisting and deploring them. A contrast is everywhere conspicuous between the passivity of the clerical body in presence of our various atrocities, and the active opposition of the rationalist bodies and their leaders. Next to nothing was said in orthodox quarters respecting our unjust breach of the treaty with the Ashantees, or the disgraceful acquittal against evidence of the man who shot three native children in Natal. The smashing of Coomassee was rejoiced over by a leading weekly organ of Christianity, while nothing was said by ministers of religion about brutalities committed by our officers in Perak. Meanwhile, I have quoted Mr. Frederic Harrison on the Afghan doings; now hear another rationalist on our exploits in South Africa. One of the earliest protests against the Zulu war came from Mr. John Morley, when in two articles in this Review² he condemned British conduct in the matter of that war as "one of the worst crimes that have been perpetrated in our history." After commenting on the "impious and sanguinary" utterances of an orthodox preacher in Grahams-town (to which utterances on the British position, rights, and duties in Zululand Sir Bartle Frere had drawn the attention of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as the "outspoken opinions of a thoughtful, religious man"), Mr. Morley remarks—

"It would only be too easy to . . . make mock at the priests of the creed of brotherly love . . . wading through slaughter to a pulpit to preach how blessed are the peacemakers. But the spirit of mockery dies away in us, in shame and humiliation that we . . . are now once more embarking on that very course of policy towards a lower race which from our childhood upwards we have all been taught to abhor in the Spanish and Portuguese tyrants of the

(1) *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1879 (p. 639).

(2) See Fortnightly Review for March and April, 1879.

sixteenth century.¹ . . . Even assuming it to be the destiny of England to supersede the poor germs of civilisation among these less fortunate members of the human family, it is not by the violent and precipitate annexation of kingdoms and provinces that such an end is to be gained. . . . Patience, caution, moderation—but before all else patience—these are the key-words of a true policy.”² . . .

Again,³—

“It is for the people of England to decide whether . . . the old realm which was once the home of justice and freedom is to be transformed into a Pirate-Empire, with the Cross hypocritically chalked upon its black flag.”

Such is the moral colour of modern philosophical heterodoxy, and so fast as a creed approaches the scientific standard, until it reaches that standard completely, does it show increased readiness to throw forth humanely vigorous action. Scarcely an English evolutionist or positivist of eminence has held his peace in face of our recent inhumanities in Africa and Asia; and the leaders and members of heterodox congregations, secularist and theological, have been almost equally earnest in the same cause. Public meetings are addressed, and efforts set afoot in repudiation of British atrocities by the politicians who are more or less formally detached from all orthodox churches; printed protests of the same character bear such signatures as those of Herbert Spencer, John Morley, Frederic Harrison, and Dr. Congreve; and from heterodox bodies emanate nearly all the petitions to Parliament to check governmental bullyings and colonial aggressions. But while rationalism of all grades, and apparently in proportion to its degree, thus evinces a leaning to national generosity and humane principle, orthodoxy is naturally bent chiefly on its own propagation, and that of British rule as conducive to its own propagation, among the weak tribes into whose midst it carries at once arms and Bibles.

Nor was the spirit of Christianity at the seat of war more consistent, or more inclined to make home-thrusts at actual wrong-doing. One Cape paper stated that “while the colony is making strenuous efforts to disarm the natives, the missionaries are giving away guns of a superior sort in order to induce the chiefs to allow them to pursue their labours in peace.” That the gospel of good-will and peace on earth may be verbally preached with ease and safety to the preacher, it is to be practically annulled beforehand by bribing with arms of war the heathen he seeks to attract! Truly, in face of this, one may long for the time when religion shall no longer have the power to paralyse the morality it professes to patronise. Again, also from South Africa :—

“The *Christian Express* reports fighting amongst the natives in the interior, in which some of the mission people were engaged.”

(1) *Fortnightly Review*, March, 1879 (p. 350).

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 352.

(3) *Ibid.*, April, 1879, p. 562.

Thus while orthodoxy at home was largely in favour of the war, orthodoxy on the spot fanned its fury.

We would not overlook or misappreciate those pleasant but too rare instances where ministers of the English Church have risen above the general current of orthodox passivity, and have spoken bravely against recent cases of inhumane British policy. Still less can be forgotten the earnest protests entered against the South African and Afghan wars by Protestant Nonconformists, who made common cause with rationalists, at the time of the last general election, in stoutly repudiating those wars, and the iniquities they entailed, as a disgrace to British arms. But the fact remains that whereas the *body* of orthodoxy and the body of its chief upholders have publicly shown relative indifference to the ferocities of English rule, and have again and again been, for the sake of British interests, found passive in face of the enormities committed in name of those interests; the *body* of scientific heterodoxy, and nearly all its chief leaders, have been invariably found on the side of humanity, and relatively eager in its defence. And it is here maintained that the contrary charge brought against science by Mr. Goldwin Smith is, in face of this fact, unfair as it is unfounded.

L. S. BEVINGTON.

CO-OPERATIVE FARMING.

THE condition into which foreign competition and a series of disastrous seasons have brought the agricultural interest of this country is one of so serious a nature that it is not surprising those most directly interested are turning their attention to new and hitherto untried measures in the hope of bettering it. Possibly not the least promising of these new measures is the one which was put forward at a meeting of landowners and others not long ago held at the Westminster Palace Hotel. Co-operative farming, of which we have had as yet little or no practical experience, has such attractive possibilities connected with it that, under existing circumstances, it is certainly worthy of a trial. Both from an economical and a social point of view it is possible to conceive a vast amount of work which might be accomplished by it of so important and beneficial a character as to claim the interest and support of almost every section of the community.

Carefully premising that there are not a few practical difficulties to be overcome, we propose to enumerate some of the results which may be looked for from co-operation in this great department of industry, first taking a brief glance at the present agricultural situation. There are, at this moment, thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of acres of land in England either totally out of cultivation or at best only temporarily attended to by its owners. According to all report this area is growing larger every day. Not only to those immediately concerned, but to the country at large, the present state and future occupancy of this land are matters of considerable importance. Its former occupiers are gone—totally ruined, or at any rate completely and for ever incapacitated from turning their attention to farming again in this country. In looking to the future, they may, for all practical purposes, be passed by, although to those acquainted with them this cannot be done without a word of commiseration for their severe, and in most cases unmerited, misfortunes. Theirs is likely to be a sad end to a life of painstaking industry and respectability.

The nominal owners of the land are many of them almost as ill-qualified to hold it for any length of time as their late unfortunate tenants. What they have been accustomed to look for from it is rent, which has perhaps been their sole dependence; and when, instead of having to hold out their hand to take it, they have been suddenly called upon to dip that hand into a possibly empty pocket, to provide the means for carrying on a temporary and unprofitable cultivation, their position and sensations may be easily

imagined. Some have found themselves utterly unequal to the emergency, and have allowed their land to go out of cultivation altogether, thereby entailing a heavy legacy of after trouble and loss. Others, and these the greater part, have risen to the occasion so far as to keep the ground in some sort of cultivation, and partially check the growth of weeds; but as they have been unable or unwilling to go beyond this, to the extent of farming well, their labour has been of little profit, and the land remains in a practically unproductive state. Even those who, financially speaking, are well able to carry on a permanent and real cultivation, do not, as a rule, for the simple reason that they have no intention that the existing state of things shall continue a moment longer than they can help. They, like the others, are anxious to get fresh tenants for their land as soon as possible.

When and whence fresh tenants of the ordinary kind are coming is a problem which is racking the brain of many a needy owner and harassed agent at this moment. That no satisfactory solution of it will be arrived at for some time to come is certain from causes which are so palpable as scarcely to need pointing out. The land fever is over, for the present at any rate, and great must be the amazement of owners and agents at the difference which a few years have brought about in this respect. The plain truth is, there are very few amongst the ordinary class from which applicants were formerly recruited who are able, even if they should be willing, to take such land, involving, as it does, a large outlay and a long period of waiting before any substantial return is at all likely to be forthcoming. As on the field of battle there are many wounded for one who is slain outright, so amongst the farming community at the present moment there are not a few who, although not as yet absolutely ruined and sold up, are so crippled that they can neither remain where they are in comfort nor go elsewhere even to a smaller holding, much less can they find means to put their sons into farms, as they have been accustomed to do. Neither is it of any further use for landowners in search of tenants to look citywards in the hope of finding them. Whether the bad seasons have frightened them, or whether trade is not so flourishing as formerly, it is certain that at the present time we hear of no more successful traders rushing into the country enthusiastically eager to try their hands at agriculture, and taste the delights of rural life as exemplified in the management of a farm. After a careful survey of the agricultural position, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that, as far as all ordinary applicants are concerned, the tenantless land is likely to remain tenantless for a considerable and indefinite time to come.

Here, then, to all appearance, is an exceptionally favourable

opportunity for the initiation of an experiment in co-operative farming. This tenantless land, which is crying out for some one to come and cultivate it, lies temptingly open to the experimentalist. Notwithstanding the heavy cloud which at present hangs over it there are capabilities and advantages connected with it of no mean value, and if some form of associated enterprise—some combination of capital and skill, could be organized on a practical basis to take it in hand and restore it even to its former state of fertility, this alone would be sufficient to authorise the attempt. But when once fairly launched there are possibilities connected with agricultural co-operation which extend far beyond this. Not only may it be expected to restore the land to its former state of fertility, but to increase and develop that fertility to a very considerable extent. There is no denying that a great deal of the land in question has hitherto been only half-stocked, half-cultivated, and very indifferently manured. This fact may account to some extent for the state in which it now is, and for some of the misfortunes of its former occupants. Too many of them, it is certain, had not sufficient capital, and without *that*, whatever their skill, it was impossible for them to do full justice to the land. A powerful corporation, carrying on extensive operations and possessed of abundant resources, would be able to bring to bear to the greatest advantage every possible means of developing the latent fertility of the soil, and turning its produce to the most profitable account. Hence, assuming an adequate amount of skill in the conduct of the undertaking and proper conditions, we may expect to see, in connection with the very land which is now held of so little account as to be tenantless, results which would astonish none more than those who have been ruined on it. Co-operative farming should be essentially the best of farming. The stock should be the best for practical purposes that could be procured, and there should be as much of it as the land could possibly be made to carry. Its management and system of cultivation should be the most approved, and at the same time the most economical. The appliances of every kind should be the most effective. Every available source of profit should be studied and developed to the fullest possible extent. The manures, other than those made on the land, should be such as not to unduly whip and stimulate, but to supply those elements in which it is most lacking, and so permanently maintain its fertility. All this may be regarded as nearly a foregone conclusion, nevertheless it cannot be too strongly insisted on, seeing that it is upon the careful fulfilment of the conditions above enumerated that the value and success of co-operative farming would mainly depend. Presently we may have to refer to some drawbacks and dangers to which it will be liable, and if no distinctive line can be marked out for it sufficiently promising, not merely to outweigh these, but to give it

a decided prospect of advantage over that ordinary style of private farming which has lately proved so unprofitable, it is difficult to see how it can with any reasonable assurance be commended to public attention. We may assume, however, as a matter of course, that co-operative farming would be neither the slovenly hand-to-mouth practice of too many ordinary farmers nor the peddling child's-play of the enthusiastic, ill-guided amateur, but a scientific and consistent application of the best-known and approved principles and practices in every branch to which its operations should extend ; and, assuming this, we may forecast for it a career of profit and great public utility. It would transform the now desolate-looking, tenantless, or half-cultivated land which should be fortunate enough to come under its influence into a picture of plenty, cover it with gross and luxuriant crops of corn, clover, and roots. It would fill the now empty stock-yards with choice cattle, and make the uplands resound with the bleating of its flocks. It would furnish to our teeming and hungry town population a plentiful supply of the best home-grown food—beef, mutton, pork, bacon, milk, butter, cheese, and even poultry, eggs, and vegetables. It would put the unlucky labourer, who, in the neighbourhood of these tenantless and uncultivated farms, has had but a sorry time of it lately, into full employment again, and so restore prosperity to many a languishing village and little town in the agricultural districts. It would in time do more than this. If it duly fulfilled its mission of working only on the best lines of practice, every spot in which its operations were carried on would become a stimulating and beneficial example to all the country round. The agricultural mind is proverbially slow to receive impressions, even the most palpable, but the pressure of circumstances is beginning to have a wonderfully vivifying effect on it, and it is awakening to the absolute necessity of keeping pace with the march of improvement. Hence it may happen that some of the very farms which are now little better than a nuisance to the adjoining lands, disseminating noxious weeds and rubbish in every direction, may, in the future, become irradiating centres of light and progress.

Co-operative farming indeed, being of the character we have assumed it to be, might go even further in this direction and turn its example and educational facilities to profitable as well as useful account. Every one of its farming establishments might and should be a practical school of agriculture where those intending to devote themselves to the cultivation of the soil at home or abroad could be trained and taught. Here is a source of both profit and usefulness which in any scheme of co-operative farming should be carefully kept in view. These establishments would also be excellent training schools for labourers who, after a course of work upon them, would be able to take situations in other quarters with increased credit to

themselves and advantage to their employers. This reference to the labourer brings us to another possible feature of co-operative farming of considerable social interest and importance, and that is the new and improved relationship it might be able to establish between capital and labour in connection with agriculture ; indeed, any plan of the kind would be very incomplete which did not include some effort in this direction in its programme. Of late the straits of the landowner and farmer have taken up so much attention that the labourer has been almost forgotten, although he too has undoubtedly been a sufferer. When he has been referred to in connection with agricultural depression it has not been for the purpose of enlisting sympathy in his behalf, but rather to lay at his door a serious share of blame in helping to bring that depression about. The enormous increase in the rate of wages he has received during late years and the almost equal decrease in the quantity and quality of the work he has given in return, have been the stock topics of complaint in agricultural circles and much of the farmers' trouble has been attributed to these things. When the Assistant Commissioners for inquiring into the causes of agricultural depression were taking evidence throughout the country, there was no question so persistently put as one tending to elicit information on these points or on which there was such a perfect concurrence of opinion. This, of course, is partial and onesided testimony, but we may equally gather from other and opposite sources that the present relationship between agricultural capital and labour has very few satisfactory or promising features about it. Notwithstanding the great increase which has taken place in the labourer's pay it is still low in comparison with almost every other employment, and the farmer in his present extremity does not hesitate to cut it down wherever he can. Hence there is now, as there has been for many years past, long before strikes and unionism were heard of, a continual exodus from the rural districts of the very cream of the labouring population, the most active and intelligent, the brightest and the best. The natural consequence of such a sifting is that the greater part of those who remain behind are of so low a calibre, physical and intellectual, as fully to account for and justify the complaints that are made as to the poor quality and deficient quantity of their work. They are but the scum and the refuse of the peasantry, the dull, the feeble, and the leaden-footed, who have not had strength or wit enough to get away, and at a time when the pressure of foreign competition renders it necessary that our agriculture should be improved and perfected in every possible way these are the only tools that are left to work with.

In connection with co-operative farming an earnest effort may and certainly should be made to rectify this state of things. He

would be a sanguine man who should confidently predict the success of such an experiment, but no amount of pains would be ill-bestowed which should ensure it. The great thing to be achieved is to attach the labourer to the soil and induce him to take pride and delight in his calling. Perhaps by giving him an interest in the results of his work and bringing him under the influence of the novel sensation of ownership this might be brought about. If so, it would be in perfect accordance with the principles on which co-operative farming should be based to enter into such arrangements as would place him in this position. Whilst not allowing him to step out of his proper place, he might yet be so dealt with as to be made to feel that his own well-being was inseparably bound up in the success of the operations he was called on to perform and that all around him was in a certain sense his own, making it incumbent on him to look after it as far as lay in his power. Some may think that no terms which could be consistently offered him would have such an effect on his sluggish and undeveloped nature as to call forth these feelings to the extent desired ; but few are in a position to form a sound judgment on this point, the treatment he has generally hitherto received having been diametrically opposite to that here indicated. Whether of malice prepense or not, the policy which has heretofore been pursued towards him has been utterly to detach and divorce him from the soil and cut him off from all living interest in it. Because in these circumstances he has shown little gratitude or attachment to it, we are by no means warranted in assuming that, under a new and opposite method of treatment, a new and better set of feelings would not be awakened in him. Of course this change would not be effected all at once ; great and real transformations seldom are, a certain amount of education being at all times necessary. Labour and patience are required to lead people even to their own good, and if these factors were brought to bear in this case, there is little or rather no reason at all to doubt that they would meet with the results which usually attend them in a righteous cause. Perhaps, owing to circumstances we have not space to enter upon here, few at the present moment are able fully to estimate the importance from a social, economical, and even political point of view of such a transformation. All, however, will readily admit that a prosperous and contented peasantry must certainly be better than a dissatisfied and ill-conditioned one, and if by means of co-operative farming a sensible advance towards such a change could be brought about, this alone should be sufficient to enlist a large amount of support in its behalf.

The possibilities which lie before co-operative farming, inaugurated on a sound basis and conducted on proper business principles, may thus be briefly summed up. By means of it much land which now

is, and threatens to remain, in a practically unproductive state, may not only be restored to its former fertility, but to greatly increased fertility. It may be assumed, indeed, that all it *can* be made to yield under this new *régime* it will be made to yield, and thus will a large increase of the best home produce be made available for consumption. The example set by the co-operative farms, together with the direct teaching in the best principles of agriculture given at them, would be greatly effective in promoting the improved cultivation of other land, which would lead to a still further increase in the quantity of home-grown food, for which, notwithstanding our enormous foreign importations, there is, on account of its generally superior quality, a practically unlimited demand. Finally, the moral and physical status of the labourer may, in connection with it, certainly be raised to some extent, and possibly to such an extent as to attach him firmly to the soil, and enable him to live, and thrive, and make some provision for old age from his labours upon it. It scarcely needs pointing out that all these things are of national importance, for whatever tends to promote the productiveness of our native soil and the well-being of those connected with it tends also directly to promote the prosperity of the community at large.

There remains one vitally important question to be put and answered in connection with co-operative farming, and that is, can it be made to pay, and, if so, under what conditions? Unless it can be set going on the sound commercial basis of dividing a fair interest on capital it is of little use pointing out any national benefits which may accrue from it. The Westminster Palace Hotel meeting at which the idea was broached was convened for the purpose of discussing the difficulties of the agricultural situation, and devising a remedy. Now, of course, it would be a very nice thing for a number of distressed landowners to have the tenantless farms they have not the means to cultivate taken off their hands, and brought into a high state of cultivation by a rich company; and it would be an equally good thing for a number of distressed farmers to have snug berths provided for them as managers of these farms. But neither landowner nor farmer is in a position to provide the capital for the undertaking, which must be sought in quite other quarters, and will most assuredly not be forthcoming unless it can be shown that the investment is likely to prove a safe and remunerative one. The land mania does not come into play here. The monied man, eager for the delights of rural life, and the cautious investor looking for half-yearly dividends, are quite different individuals. The conditions which would suit landowners wanting tenants, and farmers wanting employment or capital, may not be such as would be consistent with the interests of the capitalist who is asked to provide the

means to set the undertaking in motion. To enlist the support of the latter, it is indispensable that co-operative farming should not be taken up merely as a means of tiding over a temporary difficulty in connection with agriculture, but that it should have all the elements of permanent success—that the capital invested in it should not be in any danger of being dissipated in the course of a few years, but should rather, if possible, be in a fair way of earning an increment in addition to paying a legitimate current interest. Nor is there any reason to doubt that this result may be attained, provided certain necessary conditions are laid down and rigidly adhered to. As before observed, the farming must be of the best. It must be a true and complete blending of science with practice in every branch of the business—a carrying out of agriculture to its highest possible development, with the object of profit kept always prominently in view. This, as all will see, involves qualifications of a very high order on the part of those engaged in the management of the undertaking. Men possessed of such qualifications are obtainable, but they are rare; and upon the extent to which they are attracted to it the permanent success of co-operative farming will greatly depend. Deputy farming, as a rule, is not attended with very profitable results, as the proprietor of many a home farm can testify. Bailiffs and managers of other men's farms are too apt to rely on the depth of their employer's pocket, and even dip dishonestly into it occasionally. They too often neglect that careful overlooking and close attention to detail which are indispensable to the commercial success of every business, and to none more so than farming. Very frequently they are incompetent, and sometimes, when possessed of skill, are fatally curbed by the proprietor's want of faith and enterprise, or controlled by his whims and hobbies. Co-operative farming will not escape trials and difficulties arising from this source. They are to be overcome by a careful selection of men, by giving them a vital interest in the commercial results of their work, and by exercising a constant and intelligent supervision over them from head-quarters.

Another point which will need to be closely looked into in order to establish co-operative farming on a permanent and successful basis is the tenure and conditions on which the land is to be held. No yearly agreement based on "a good understanding between landlord and tenant" will be available in this case. Nor will any ordinary farm lease be sufficient. Once a co-operative farm always a co-operative farm must be the guiding principle to be kept in mind. Companies may and do die, we know, sometimes violent and unnatural deaths, but their existence is assumed to be a continuous one, and the way to make it so is to take care at the outset that they

shall have as few elements of a temporary or unstable nature in them as possible. To attract capital into this channel, and to ensure its safe and profitable employment after, it is indispensable that the hold upon the land should be a firm one, permanent if possible, and if liable to termination at any period, only on such conditions as will secure a full and complete recoupment both of outlay and earned increment. Successful co-operative farming implies a large expenditure not only in developing the resources of the soil, but in providing ample accommodation and conveniences for the housing and economical feeding of stock and other purposes. If all this expenditure is to be made by the associated tenants, such conditions must be granted as will fully warrant them in the outlay and secure a lengthened and complete occupancy as well. There must be an entire giving over of the land into their hands. If landowners are unable or unwilling to make such concessions then it will be very unwise to attempt to establish co-operation on their estates. It would be far better to purchase land outright; indeed, it is a grave question whether this is not the best and the only sound basis on which co-operative farming operations can be carried out. Certain it is that the idea presents itself, both from a business and a national point of view, in a far more attractive and promising aspect in connection with land of its own than when involved in the uncertainties and entanglements of a temporary tenancy, however carefully its conditions may be arranged. A whole host of difficulties and possible hindrances would be swept away at a blow and the course would be open for the freest and fullest development in every direction. There is at the present time abundance of land in the market, to be had on reasonable terms, which would be suitable for the purpose. The purchase of this land and its cultivation on the most approved principles would not only open up a new channel for the safe and fairly remunerative employment of capital, but would afford a number of people an opportunity of acquiring a stake in their native soil—of becoming, in fact, part proprietors of it.

WM. HAZLITT ROBERTS.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.

PART I. CENSUS OF THE MOHAMMEDAN WORLD. THE HAJ.

IN the lull, which we hope is soon to break the storm of party strife in England, it may not perhaps be impossible to direct public attention to the rapid growth of questions which for the last few years have been agitating the religious mind of Asia, and which are certain before long to present themselves as a very serious perplexity to British statesmen; questions, moreover, which if not dealt with by them betimes, it will later be found out of their power to deal with at all, though a vigorous policy at the present moment might yet solve them to this country's very great advantage.

The revival which is taking place in the Mohammedan world is indeed worthy of every Englishman's attention, and it is difficult to believe that it has not received anxious consideration at the hands of those whose official responsibility lies chiefly in the direction of Asia; but I am not aware that it has hitherto been placed in its true light before the English public, or that a quite definite policy regarding it may be counted on as existing in the counsels of the present Cabinet. Indeed, as regards the Cabinet, the reverse may very well be the case. We know how suspicious English politicians are of policies which may be denounced by their enemies as speculative; and it is quite possible that the very magnitude of the problem to be solved in considering the future of Islam may have caused it to be put aside there as one "outside the sphere of practical politics." The phrase is a convenient one, and is much used by those in power amongst us who would evade the labour or the responsibility of great decisions. Yet that such a problem exists in a new and very serious form I do not hesitate to affirm, nor will my proposition, as I think, be doubted by any who have mingled much in the last few years with the Mussulman populations of Western Asia. There it is easily discernible that great changes are impending, changes perhaps analogous to those which Christendom underwent four hundred years ago, and that a new departure is urgently demanded of England if she would maintain even for a few years her position as the guide and arbiter of Asiatic progress.

It was not altogether without the design of gaining more accurate knowledge than I could find elsewhere on the subject of this Mo-

hammedan revival that I visited Jeddah in the early part of the past winter, and that I subsequently spent some months in Egypt and Syria in the almost exclusive society of Mussulmans. Jeddah, I argued, the seaport of Mecca and only forty miles distant from that famous centre of the Moslem universe, would be the most convenient spot from which I could obtain such a bird's-eye view of Islam as I was in search of; and I imagined rightly that I should there find myself in an atmosphere less provincial than that of Cairo, or Bagdad, or Constantinople. Jeddah is indeed in the pilgrim season the suburb of a great metropolis, and even a European stranger there feels that he is no longer in a world of little thoughts and local aspirations. On every side the politics he hears discussed are those of the great world, and the religion professed is that of a wider Islam than he has been accustomed to in Turkey or in India. There every race and language are represented, and every sect. Indians, Persians, Moors, are there,—negroes from the Niger, Malays from Java, Tartars from the Khanates, Arabs from the French Sahara, from Oman and Zanzibar, even, in Chinese dress and undistinguishable from other natives of the Celestial Empire, Mussulmans from the interior of China. As one meets these walking in the streets, one's view of Islam becomes suddenly enlarged, and one is forced to exclaim with Sir Thomas Browne, "Truly the (Mussulman) world is greater than that part of it geographers have described." The permanent population, too, of Jeddah is a microcosm of Islam. It is made up of individuals from every nation under heaven. Besides the indigenous Arab, who has given his language and his tone of thought to the rest, there is a mixed resident multitude descended from the countless pilgrims who have remained to live and die in the holy cities. These preserve, to a certain extent, their individuality, at least for a generation or two, and maintain a connection with the lands to which they owe their origin and the people who were their countrymen. Thus there is constantly found at Jeddah a free mart of intelligence for all that is happening in the world; and the common gossip of the bazaar retails news from every corner of the Mussulman earth. It is hardly too much to say that one can learn more of modern Islam in a week at Jeddah than in a year elsewhere, for there the very shopkeepers discourse of things divine, and even the Frank Vice-Consuls prophecy. The Hejazi is less shy, too, of discussing religious matters than his fellow Mussulmans are in other places. Religion is, as it were, part of his stock-in-trade, and he is accustomed to parade it before strangers. With a European he may do this a little disdainfully, but still he will do it, and with less disguise or desire to please than is in most places the case. Moreover—and this is important—it is almost always the practical side of questions that the

commercial Jeddah will put forward. He sees things from a political and economical point of view, rather than a doctrinal, and if fanatical, he is so from the same motives, and no others, which once moved the citizens of Ephesus to defend the idols worshipped at their shrines. In other cities the Ulema, or learned men, of whom a stranger might seek instruction, would be found busying themselves mainly with doctrinal matters not always interesting at the present day, old-world arguments of Koranic interpretation which have from time immemorial occupied the schools. But here even these are treated practically, and as they bear on the political aspect of the hour. For myself, I became speedily impressed with the advantage thus afforded me, and neglected no opportunity which offered itself for listening and asking questions, so that without pretending to the possession of more special skill than any intelligent inquirer might command, I obtained a mass of information I cannot but think to be of great value—while this in its turn served me later as an introduction to such Mussulman divines as I afterwards met in the North. Jeddah then realised all my hopes and gratified nearly all my curiosities. I will own, too, to having come away with more than a gratified curiosity, and to having found new worlds of thought and life in an atmosphere I had fancied to be only of decay. I was astonished at the vigorous life of Islam, at its practical hopes and fears in this modern nineteenth century, and above all at its reality as a moral force; so that if I had not exactly come to mock, I certainly remained, in a certain sense, to pray. At least I left it interested, as I had never thought to be, in the great struggle which seemed to me impending between the parties of reaction in Islam and reform, and not a little hopeful as to its favourable issue. What this is likely to be I now intend to discuss.

First, however, it will I think be as well to survey briefly the actual composition of the Mohammedan world. It is only by a knowledge of the elements of which Islam is made up that we can guess its future, and these are less generally known than they should be. A stranger from Europe visiting the Hejaz is, as I have said, irresistibly struck with the vastness of the religious world in whose centre he stands. Mohammedanism to our Western eyes seems almost bounded by the limits of the Ottoman Empire. The Turk stands in our foreground and has stood there from the days of Bajazet, and in our vulgar tongue his name is still synonymous with Moslem, so that we are apt to look upon him as, if not the only, at least the chief figure of Islam. But from Arabia we see things in a truer perspective, and become aware that beyond and without the Ottoman dominions there are races and nations, no less truly followers of the Prophet, beside whom the Turk shrinks into numerical insignificance. We catch sight, it may

be for the first time in their real proportions, of the old Persian and Mogul monarchies, of the forty million Mussulmans of India, of the thirty million Malays, of the fifteen million Chinese, and the vast and yet uncounted Mohammedan populations of Central Africa. We see, too, how important is still the Arabian element, and how necessary it is to count with it, in any estimate we may form of Islam's possible future. Turkey, meanwhile, and Constantinople, retire to a rather remote horizon, and the Mussulman centre of gravity is as it were shifted from the north and west towards the south and east.

I was at some pains while at Jeddah to gain accurate statistics of the Haj according to the various races and sects composing it, and with them of the populations they in some measure represent. The pilgrimage is of course no certain guide as to the composition of the Mussulman world, for many accidents of distance and political circumstance interfere with calculations based on it. Still to a certain extent a proportion is preserved between it and the populations which supply it; and, in default of better, statistics of the Haj afford us an index not without value of the degree of religious vitality existing in the various Mussulman countries. My figures, which for convenience I have arranged in tabular form, are taken principally from an official record, kept for some years past at Jeddah, of the pilgrims landed at that port, and checked as far as European subjects are concerned by reference to the consular agents residing there. They may therefore be relied upon as fairly accurate; while for the land pilgrimage I trust in part my own observations, made three years ago, in part statistics obtained at Cairo and Damascus. For the table of population in the various lands of Islam I am obliged to go more directly to European sources of information. As may be supposed, no statistics on this point of any value were obtainable at Jeddah; but by taking the figures commonly given in our handbooks, and supplementing and correcting these by reference to such persons as I could find who knew the countries, I have, I hope, arrived at an approximation to the truth, near enough to give a tolerable idea to general readers of the numerical proportions of Islam. Strict accuracy, however, I do not here pretend to, nor would it if obtainable materially help my present argument.

The following is my table:—

TABLE OF THE MECCA PILGRIMAGE OF 1880.

Nationality of Pilgrims.	Arriving by Sea.	Arriving by Land.	Total of Mussulman population represented.
Ottoman subjects including pilgrims from Syria and Irak, but not from Egypt or Arabia proper	8,500	1,000	22,000,000
Egyptians	5,000	1,000	5,000,000
Mogrebins ("people of the West"), that is to say Arabic-speaking Mussulmans from the Barbary States, Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco. These are always classed together and are not easily distinguishable from each other	6,000	..	18,000,000
Arabs from Yemen	3,000	..	2,500,000
„ „ Oman and Hadramaut	3,000	..	3,000,000
„ „ Nejd, Assir, and Hasa, most of them Wahhabites	5,000	4,000,000
„ „ Hejaz, of these perhaps 10,000 Meccans	22,000	2,000,000
Negroes from Soudan	2,000	..	10,000,000(?)
„ „ Zanzibar	1,000	..	1,500,000
Malabari from the Cape of Good Hope	150
Persians	6,000	2,500	8,000,000
Indians (British subjects)	15,000	..	40,000,000
Malays, chiefly from Java and Dutch subjects	12,000	..	30,000,000
Chinese	100	..	15,000,000
Mongols from the Khanates, included in the Ottoman Haj	6,000,000
Lazis, Circassians, Tartars, &c. (Russian subjects), included in the Ottoman Haj	5,000,000
Independent Afghans and Beluchis, included in the Indian and Persian Hajs	3,000,000
Total of pilgrims present at Arafat	93,250		175,000,000
	Total Census of Islam		

The figures thus roundly given require explanation in order to be of their full value as a bird's-eye view of Islam. I will take them as nearly as possible in the order in which they stand, grouping them, however, for further convenience sake under their various sectarian heads, for it must be remembered that Islam, which in its institution was intended to be one community, political and religious, is now divided not only into many nations, but into many sects. All, however, hold certain fundamental beliefs, and all perform the pil-

grimage to Mecca, where they meet on common ground, and it is to this latter fact that the importance attached to the Haj is mainly owing.

The main beliefs common to all Mussulmans are—

1. A belief in one true God, the creator and ordainer of all things.
2. A belief in a future life of reward or punishment.
3. A belief in a divine revelation imparted first to Adam and renewed at intervals to Noah, to Abraham, to Moses, and to Jesus Christ, and last of all in its perfect form to Mohammed. This revelation is not only one of dogma, but of practice. It claims to have taught an universal rule of life for all mankind in politics and legislation as well as in doctrine and in morals. This is called Islam.
4. A belief in the Koran as the literal word of God, and of its inspired interpretation by the Prophet and his companions, preserved through tradition (Hadith).

These summed up in the well-known "Kelemat" or act of faith, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the apostle of God," form a common doctrinal basis for every sect of Islam—and also common to all are the four religious acts, prayer, fasting, almsgiving and pilgrimage, ordained by the Koran itself. On other points, however, both of belief and practice, they differ widely; so widely that the sects must be considered as not only distinct from, but hostile to, each other. They are nevertheless, it must be admitted, less absolutely irreconcilable than are the corresponding sects of Christianity, for all allow the rest to be distinctly within the pale of Islam, and they pray on occasion in each other's mosques and kneel at the same shrines on pilgrimage. Neither do they condemn each other's errors as altogether damnable—except, I believe, in the case of the Wahhabites, who accuse other Moslems of polytheism and idolatry. The census of the four great sects may be thus roughly given—

1. The Sunites or Orthodox Mohammedans . . .	145,000,000
2. The Shiites or Sect of Ali	15,000,000
3. The Abadites (Abadhiyeh)	7,000,000
4. The Wahhabites	8,000,000

The *Sunites*, or People of the Path, are of course by far the most important of these. They stand in that relation to the other sects in which the Catholic Church stands to the various Christian heresies, and claim alone to represent that continuous body of tradition political and religious, which is the sign of a living church. In addition to the dogmas already mentioned, they hold that, after the Prophet and his companions, other authorised channels of tradition exist of hardly less authority with these. The sayings of the four first Caliphs, as collected in the first century of the Mohammedan era, they hold to be inspired and unimpeachable, as are to a certain extent the theological treatises of the four great doctors of Islam, the

Imams Abu Hanifah, Malek, Esh Shafy, and Hanbal, and after them, though with less and less authority, the "fetwas," or decisions of distinguished Ulema, down to the present day. The collected body of teaching acquired from these sources is called the Sheriat (in Turkey the Sheriati Sherifch) and is the canon law of Islam. Nor is it lawful that this should be gainsaid; while the Imams themselves may not inaptly be compared to the fathers of our Christian Church. It is a dogma, too, with the Sunites that they are not only an ecclesiastical but a political body, and that among them is the living representative of the temporal power of the Prophet, in the person of his Khalifah or successor, though there is much division of opinion as to the precise line of succession in the past and the legitimate ownership of the title in the present. But this is too intricate and important a matter to be entered on at present.

The Sunites are then the body of authority and tradition, and being more numerous than the other three sects put together in a proportion of four and a half to one, have a good right to treat these as heretics. It must not, however, be supposed that even the Sunites profess absolutely homogeneous opinions. The path of Orthodox Islam is no macadamised road such as the Catholic Church of Christendom has become, but like one of its own Haj routes goes winding on, a labyrinth of separate tracks, some near, some far apart, some clean out of sight of the rest. All lead, it is true, in the same main direction, and here and there in difficult ground where there is a mountain range to cross or where some defile narrows they are brought together, but otherwise they follow their own ways as the idiosyncrasy of race and disposition may dictate. There is no common authority in the world acknowledged as superior to the rest, neither is there any office corresponding even remotely with the infallible Papacy. The Mohammedan nations have for the most part each its separate school, composed of its own Ulema and presided over by its own Sheykh el Islam, and these are independent of all external influence. If they meet at all it is at Mecca, but even at Mecca there is no college of cardinals, no central authority; and though occasionally cases are referred there or to Constantinople, the fetwas given are not of absolute binding power over the faithful in other lands. Moreover, besides these national distinctions, there are three recognised schools of theology which divide between them the allegiance of the orthodox, and which, while not in theory opposed, do in fact represent as many distinct lines of religious thought. These it has been the fashion with European writers to describe as sects, but the name sect is certainly inaccurate, for the distinctions recognisable in their respective teachings are not more clearly marked than in those of our own Church parties, the high, the low, and the broad. Indeed a rather striking analogy may be traced between these three phases

of English church teaching and the three so-called "orthodox sects" of Islam. The three Mohammedan schools are the Hanefite, the Malekite, and the Shafite, while a fourth, the Hanbalite, is usually added, but it numbers at the present day so few followers that we need not notice it. A few words will describe each of these.

The *Hanefite* school of theology may be described as the school of the upper classes. It is the high and dry party of Church and State, if such expressions can be used about Islam. To it belongs the Osmanli race, I believe without exception, the old ruling race of the north, and their kinsman who founded Empires in Central and Southern Asia. The official classes, too, in most parts of the world are Hanefite, including the Viceregal courts of Egypt, Tripoli, and Tunis, and it would seem the courts of most of the Indian princes. It is probably rather as a consequence of this than as its reason that it is the most conservative of schools, conservative in the true sense of leaving things exactly as they are. The Turkish Ulema have always insisted strongly on the dogma that the *Ijtahad*, that is to say the elaboration of new doctrine, is absolutely closed; that nothing can be added to or taken away from the already existing body of religious law, and that no new *mujtahed*, or doctor of Islam, can be expected who shall adapt that law to the life of the modern world. At the same time, while obstinate in matters of opinion, Hanefism has become extremely lax as to practice. Its moral teaching is held, and I believe justly, to be adapted only too closely to the taste of its chief supporters. It is accused by its enemies of having given its sanction to all the excesses of libertinism common among the Turks, their use of fermented drinks, of European clothing, their immoderate concubinage and other worse vices. It is in fact, to use a phrase once common in England—the "port wine" school of Mussulman orthodoxy. It embraces most of those who at the present day support the revived spiritual pretensions of Constantinople.

The pilgrimage then described in our table as Ottoman is mostly made up of men of this theological school. It must not, however, be supposed that anything like the whole number either of the 8,500 pilgrims, or of the 22,000,000 population they represent, is composed of Turks. The true Ottoman Turk is probably now among the rarest of visitors to Mecca, and it is doubtful whether the whole Turkish census in Europe and in Asia amounts to more than four millions. With regard to the pilgrimage there is good reason why this should be the case. In Turkey, all the able-bodied young men, who are the first material of the Haj, are taken from other duties for military service, and hardly any now make their tour of the Kaaba except in the Sultan's uniform. Rich merchants, the second material of the Haj in other lands, are almost unknown among the Turks; and the officials, the only well-to-do class in the empire, have neither leisure

nor inclination to absent themselves from their worldly business of intrigue. Besides, the official Turk is already too civilised to put up readily with the real hardships of the Haj. In spite of the alleviations effected by the steam navigation of the Red Sea, pilgrimage is still no small matter, and, once landed at Jeddah, all things are much as they were a hundred years ago, while the Turk has changed. With his modern notion of dress and comfort he may indeed be excused for shrinking from the quaint nakedness of the pilgrim garb and the bare-headed march to Arafat under a tropical sun. Besides, there is the land journey still of three hundred miles to make before he can reach Medina, and what to some would be worse hardship, a wearisome waiting afterwards in the unhealthy ports of Hejaz. Besides, the Turkish official has learned to dispense with so many of the forms of his religion that he finds no difficulty in making himself excuses here. In fact, he seldom or never now makes the pilgrimage.

The mass of the Ottoman Haj is made up of Kurds, Syrians, Albanians, Circassians, Lazis, and Tartars, from Russia and the Khanates, of everything rather than real Turks. Nor are those that come distinguished greatly for their piety or learning. The school of St. Sophia at Constantinople has lost its old reputation as a seat of religious knowledge; and its Ulema are known to be more occupied with the pursuit of Court patronage than of any other science. So much indeed is this the case that serious students often prefer a residence at Bokhara or even in the heretical schools of Persia as a more real road to learning. Turkey proper boasts at the present day few theologians of note, and still fewer independent thinkers.

The Egyptian Haj is far more flourishing. Speaking the language of Arabia, the citizen of Cairo is more at home in the holy places than any inhabitant of the northern towns can be. The customs of Hejaz are very nearly his own customs, and its climate not much more severe than his. Cairo, too, can boast a far more ancient political connection with Mecca than Constantinople can, for as early as the twelfth century the Sultans of Egypt were protectors of the holy places, while even since the Ottoman conquest, the Caliph's authority in Arabia has been almost uninterruptedly interpreted by his representative at Cairo. So lately as 1830 this was the position of things at Mecca, and it is only since the opening of the Suez Canal that direct administration from Constantinople has been seriously attempted. To the present day the Viceroy of Egypt shares with the Sultan the privilege of sending a mahmal, or camel litter, to Mecca every year with a covering for the Kaaba. Moreover the Azhar-mosque of Cairo is the great university of Arabic-speaking races, and its Ulema have the highest reputation of any in Islam. Egyptian influence, therefore, must be reckoned as an important element in the forces which make up Mohammedan opinion. The late Khedive, it is true, did much to

impair this by his infidelity and his coquetteries with Europe, and under his reign the Egyptian Haj fell to a low level ; but Mohammed Towfik, who is a sincere, thorough, liberal Mussulman, has already restored much of his country's prestige at Mecca, and it is not unlikely that in time to come Egypt, grown materially prosperous, may once more take a leading part in the politics of Islam. But of this later.

All three schools of theology are taught in the Azhar mosque, and Egyptians are divided according to their class between them. The Viceroy and the ruling clique, men of Ottoman origin, are Hanefites, and so too are some of the leading merchants of Cairo, but the common people of that city are Shafites, while the fellahin of the Delta are almost entirely Malekite. Malekite, too, are the tribes west of the Nile, following the general rule of the population of Africa.

The *Malekite* school of religious thought differs widely from the Hanefite. If the latter has been described as the high Church party of Islam, this must be described as the low. It is puritanical, fierce in its dogma, severe in its morals, and those who profess it are undoubtedly the most fervent, the most fanatical of believers. They represent more nearly than any other Mussulmans the ancient earnestness of the Prophet's companions, and the sword in their hand is ever the sword of God. Piety too, ostensible and sincere, is found everywhere among the Malekites. Abd el Kader, the soldier saint, is their type ; and holy men by hereditary profession abound among them. The Malekites believe with earnest faith in things supernatural, dreaming prophetic dreams, and seeing miracles performed as every-day occurrences. With the Arabs of Africa, unlike their kinsmen in Arabia itself, it is still the fashion to pray and fast, and no class of Mussulmans are more devout on pilgrimage. In Algiers and Morocco it is as common for a young man of fortune to build a mosque as it is for him to keep a large stud of horses. To do so poses him in the world, and a life of prayer is strictly a life of fashion. With regard to morals he is severe where the Koran is severe, indulgent where it indulges. Wine with him is an abomination, and asceticism with regard to meat and tobacco is often practised by him. But he allows himself full latitude with regard to women, following in this, he says, the Prophet's example. On the whole he is respectable and respected ; but the reforms he would impose on Islam are too purely reactive to be altogether acceptable to the mass of Mohammedans or suited to the urgent necessities of the age. It is conceivable, however, that should the revival of Islam take the form of a religious war, the races of Africa may be found taking the leading part in it. Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco contain hardy races of fighting men who may yet trouble Europe ; and fifty years of rule have not yet assimilated the French Sahara.

It is difficult to gain accurate statistics as to the proportion of pilgrims sent to Mecca by these various States, but it would seem the Algerian pilgrimage is the smallest. This is due mainly to hindrances raised by the French Government, whose policy it is to isolate their province from the rest of the Mussulman world. An Algerian pilgrim is called upon to produce the sum of 1,000 francs before he is permitted to embark for Jeddah, and he is subjected to various other needless formalities. Still the number sent is large and their fervour undoubted, though the upper classes, from a fear of losing credit with the French authorities, rather hold aloof.

The mainstay of the Mogrebbin Haj are the Moors. These have an immense name for zeal and religious courage at Mecca, and for the great scrupulosity with which they perform their religious duties. There is too among the Moors a far wider level of theological education than among most Mussulmans. I made acquaintance while at Jeddah with a young Arab from beyond the Atlas who, Bedouin as he was, was an Alcm, and one sufficiently well versed in the Sheriat to be referred to more than once in my presence on points of religious law and literature. I expressed my surprise at finding a Bedouin thus learned, for he was evidently an Arab of the Arabs, but he told me his was no exceptional position, and that most Bedouins in Morocco could read the Koran. The Moors would have a still higher position in Islam than that already given them were it not that they are on one point at variance with the mass of Sunites. The Emperor of Morocco claims himself to be the Khalifeh, as representative of that ancient schism of Cordova which took place in the second century. Those therefore of the Sunites who have acknowledged the Ottoman claim are at issue with the Moors. On all other points, however, the Moors are Sunites of the Sunites.

From the Moor to the negro is but a step, though it is a step of race, perhaps of species. The political and religious connection of Morocco with the Soudan is a very close one, and, whatever may be the future of the Mediterranean provinces fronting the Spanish coast, it cannot be doubted that the Moorish form of Mohammedanism will be perpetuated in Central Africa. It is there, indeed, that Islam has the best certainty of expansion and the fairest field for a propagation of its creed. Statistics, if they could be obtained, would, I am convinced, show an immense Mohammedan progress within the last hundred years among the negro races, nor is this to be wondered at. Islam has so much to offer to the children of Ham that it cannot fail to win them—so much more than any form of Christianity or European progress can give. The Christian missionary makes his way slowly in Africa. He has no true brotherhood to offer the negro except in another life. He makes no appeal

to a present sense of dignity in the man he would convert. What Christian missionary takes a negress to wife or sits with the negro wholly as an equal at meat? Their relations remain at best those of teacher with taught, master with servant, grown man with child. The Mohammedan missionary from Morocco meanwhile stands on a different footing. He says to the negro, "Come up and sit beside me. Give me your daughter and take mine. All who pronounce the formula of Islam are equal in this world and in the next." In becoming a Mussulman even a slave acquires immediate dignity and the right to despise all men, whatever their colour, who are not as himself. This is a bribe in the hand of the preacher of the Koran, and one which has never appealed in vain to the enslaved races of the world.¹ Central Africa then may be counted on as the inheritance of Islam at no very distant day. It is already said to count ten millions of Moslems.

The *Shafite* school, the third of the four "orthodox sects," is the most flourishing of all in point of numbers, and it has characteristics which mark it out as the one best adapted to survive in the struggle which is impending between the schools of religious thought in Islam. The Shafites may be compared to our broad Church, though without its immediate tendency to infidelity. With the Shafites there is a disposition to widen rather than to narrow the area of theology. The Hanefites and Malekites proclaim loudly that inquiry has been closed and change is impossible, but the Shafites are inclined to seek a new mujtahed who shall reconcile Islam with the modern conditions of the world. They feel that there is something wrong in things as they are, for Islam is no longer politically prosperous, and they would see it united once more and re-organized even at the expense of some dogmatic concessions. I know that many even of the Shafites themselves will deny this, for no Mussulman will willingly acknowledge that he is an advocate of change; but it is unquestionable that among members of their school such ideas are more frequently found than with the others. Among the Shafites, too, ideas of a moral reformation find a footing, and they speak more openly than the rest their suspicion that the house of Othman, with its fornications and its bestialities and contempt of justice, has been the ruin of Islam. Arabian custom is the basis of its ideas upon this head, for most Arabs out of Africa if anything are Shafites; and it is the school of the virtuous poor rather than of the licentious rich. It is more humane in its bearing towards infidels, finding a common ground with them in the distinction between right and wrong. I may exaggerate this perhaps, but something of it certainly

(1) It is the secret of the rapid conversions in ancient days among the poor of the Roman and Persian Empires, and it is the secret of those now taking place among the low-caste Indians.

exists, and it is a feeling that is growing. Shafism is the prevailing school in Asia wherever Mohammedanism has been introduced through the instrumentality of Arabian missionaries. In India the mass of the Mussulman population is Shafite, especially in Hyderabad and the Bombay Presidency, where the Arab element is strongest, while Hanefism is the school of the great people who derive their origin from the Mogul conquests, and of many of the Ulema who are in the habit of making their religious education complete in the Hanefite schools of Bokhara. Wahhabism, too, in the present century has taken great hold of the poorer classes, and within the last few years a Turkish propaganda has been at work among them with some success. But of this again later.

The Indian Haj is the most numerous, and represents the largest population of all on our list, and it is besides the most wealthy. The Indian Mussulman has less to fear from the climate of Arabia than the native of more northern lands, and few who can afford it fail to perform this religious duty at least once in their lives. The English Government neither checks nor encourages the Haj, and indeed of late years has shown a rather culpable negligence as to the interests of British subjects on pilgrimage. Such at least is the opinion I heard constantly given at Jeddah, and several recent incidents seem to prove that a little closer attention to this matter would be advisable. That ugly story which was told in our newspapers more than a year ago, of the abandonment of a pilgrim ship in the Red Sea by her British captain is, I am sorry to say, a true one, and I heard it confirmed with every circumstance which could aggravate the charges made. The captain in a fit of panic left the ship without any substantial excuse, and if it had not been for the good conduct of a young man, his nephew, who, though ordered to leave too, refused out of humanity, there is little doubt that the vessel would have been lost. A very painful impression was produced on the Jeddans while I was there by the news that this English captain had been sentenced for all punishment by an English court to two years' suspension of his certificate. Indian pilgrims have besides been very roughly treated in Hejaz by the authorities during the last year because they were British subjects, and this without obtaining any redress. Such at least is the gossip of the town. However this may be, it seems to me astonishing that so important a matter as the Indian Haj should be left, as it now is, entirely in the hands of chance.

The Dutch do not so leave the management of their pilgrimage from Java, which, it will be remarked, stands second only to India on my list in respect of numbers. Their policy is a very definite one and seems justified by results. There is no disillusion, they argue, for a Mussulman greater than to have visited Mecca, and they say that a returned hajji is seldom heard to complain in Java of his lot

as the subject of a Christian power. Besides the disappointment which all pilgrims are wont to feel who come with exalted hopes and find their holy lands undistinguishable from the other lands of the world, the pilgrim to Mecca certainly has to encounter a series of dangers and annoyances which he cannot but recognise to be the result of Mussulman misgovernment. From the moment of his landing on the holy shore he finds himself beset with dangers. He is fleeced by the Turkish officials, befooled by the religious touts of the towns, and sometimes robbed openly by actual highway robbers. The religious government of the land has no redress to offer him, and the Turkish guardians of the peace who affect to rule are only potent in demanding fees. At every step he is waylaid and tricked and ill-treated. He finds the Hejazi, the keepers of the holy places and privileged ciceroni of the shrines, shrewder as men of business than devout as believers, and he returns to his home a sadder and, the Dutch say, a wiser man. I do not affirm that the Dutch are right; but this is the principle they act on, and they boast of its success. We in India, as I have said, in our grand careless way, leave all these things to chance. India, nevertheless, still holds the first rank in the Haj, and, all things considered, is now the most important land where the Mohammedan faith is found. In the day of its greatness the Mogul Empire was second to no State in Islam, and though its political power is in abeyance the religion itself is by no means in decay. India has probably a closer connection at the present moment with Mecca than any other country, and it is looked upon by many there as the Mussulman land of the future. Indeed, it may safely be affirmed that the course of events in India will determine more than anything else the destiny of Mohammedanism in the immediate future of this and the next generation.

The Malays, though holding no very high position in the commonwealth of Islam, are important from their numbers, their commercial prosperity, and, more than all to an European observer, from the fact that so many of them are Dutch subjects. Holland, if any lesson for the future can be learned in history, must in a few years find her fate linked with that of Germany, and so too her colonies. I will not now enlarge upon the prospect thus opened, but it is a suggestive one and worthy of all possible attention. For the moment the Malays stand rather apart from other pilgrims at the shrines. They boast no great school of theology or particular religious complexion; and as pilgrims they are held in rather low esteem from their penurious ways. But they are a dark element in the future, which it is equally easy to under as to over rate. Originally converted by, and to a certain degree descended from, Arabs, they are, as far as I could learn, followers of the Shafite teaching, and inclined to the broad rather than the narrow ways of Islam. They

number, according to the Dutch consular agent at Jeddah, thirty million souls, and are increasing rapidly both in Java and in the other islands of the Malay archipelago.

Another enigma are the Chinese. I saw a few of them in the streets and made inquiries as to them. But I could gain no certain information. I have heard them estimated as high as twenty millions and as low as five, but it is certain that they are very numerous. They established themselves in China, it is said, about the second century of Islam, and their missionaries were men of Arab race. They are found scattered in groups all over China, but principally inland, and have full enjoyment of their religion, being a united body which is respectable and makes itself respected—so much so that the “Houi-tse,” or people of the resurrection, as they are called, are employed in the highest offices of the Chinese State.¹ It is plain, however, that they are hardly at all connected with the modern life of Islam, for it is only within the last few years that any of them have performed the pilgrimage; and if I include them in my lists as Sunites and Shafites it is in default of other classification. They probably hold to the Mussulman world a position analogous in its isolation to that of the Abyssinian Church in Christendom. They too, however, may one day make their existence felt; for China is no dead nation, only asleep. And with them our survey of orthodox Islam ends.

Remain to us the heretical sects. Of these the most notable without contestation is the Shiite, or Sect of Ali, which traces its origin to the very day of the Prophet's death, when Abu Bekr was elected Caliph to Ali's exclusion. I will not here renew the arguments urged in this old dispute more than to say that the dispute still exists, though it has long ceased to be the only cause of difference between Shiah and Suni. Beginning merely as a political schism, the Shiite sect is now distinctly a heresy, and one which has wandered far from the orthodox road. Their principal features of quarrel with the Sunites are—first, a repudiation of the Caliphate and of all hierarchical authority whatsoever; secondly, the admission of a right of free judgment in individual doctors on matters of religion; and thirdly, a general tendency to superstitious beliefs unauthorised by the Koran or by the written testimony of the Prophet's companions. They also—and this is their great doctrinal quarrel with the unitarian Sunites—believe in a series of incarnations of the twelve qualities of God in the persons of the “twelve Imams,” and in the advent of a Messiah, or “Mohady” doctrines which are especially advanced by the Sheykhi school of Shiism and minimised by the Mutesharreh or orthodox. These last matters, however, are rather excrescences than necessary parts of Shiism. They owe

(1) Compare M. Huc's account of their origin.

their prevalence, moreover, without doubt, to the Persian mind, which is equally prone to scepticism and credulity, and where Shiism has always had its stronghold. The religious constitution of the sect of Ali has been described to me by a member of it who knows Europe well as resembling in its organization the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. That is to say, it acknowledges no head, temporal or spiritual, and each congregation represents a separate unit of authority in itself. There is no such functionary in Persia as Sheykh el Islam, or Chief of the Ulama, and the Shah claims to be neither Imam nor Caliph. Each Shiite doctor who has taken his degree at Kerbela or Ispahan may deliver his fetwa or opinion on points of doctrine, and the only test of his authority to preach or lead the prayer in mosque is his power of attracting a congregation. It is strange that in a sect which had its origin in an assertion of hereditary right to the Caliphate everything hereditary should be now rigidly excluded. In theory, I believe the Shias still hold that there is an Imam and Caliph, but they will not tolerate the pretension of any one now in authority to the title, and leave it in abeyance until the advent of the Mohady, or guide, who is to reunite Islam and restore its fortunes. So much is this the case that, sovereign though he be and absolute master in Persia, the Shah is to the present day looked upon by the Persians as a usurper, and he himself acknowledges the fact in a rather curious ceremony. It is a maxim with Mussulmans of all sects that prayer is not valid if made in another man's house without his permission, and this being so, and the Shah admitting that his palaces of right belong not to himself but to the Mohady, he is obliged to lease them according to legal form from an alom or mujtahed, acting for the supposed Mohady, before he can pray in them to his spiritual profit.

It will be readily understood that, with such an organization and with such tendencies to deductive reasoning, a wide basis is given for divergence of opinion among the Shiites, and that while the more highly educated of their mollahs occasionally preach absolute pantheism, others consult the grosser inclinations of the vulgar, and indulge their hearers with the most extravagant tales of miracle and superstition. These are a constant source of mockery to the Sunites. Among the more respectable Shiite beliefs, however, there seems to be a general conviction in Persia that a reform of Islam is at hand, and that a new leader may be expected at any moment and from any quarter, so that enthusiasts are constantly found simulating the gifts of inspiration and affecting a divine mission. The history of the Babites, so well described by M. de Gobineau in his *Religions of Asia* is a case in point, and similar occurrences are by no means rare in Persia. I met at Jeddah a highly educated Persian gentleman, who informed me that he had himself been

witness when a boy to a religious prodigy, notorious, if I remember rightly, at Tabriz. On that occasion, one of these prophets being condemned to death by the supreme government, was bound to a cross with two of his companions, and, after remaining suspended thus for several hours, was fired at by the royal troops. It then happened that, while the companions were dispatched at the first volley, the prophet himself remained unhurt, and, incredible to relate, the cords which bound him were cut by the bullets, and he fell to the ground on his feet. "You Christians," said another Persian gentleman once to me, "talk of your Christ as the Son of God and think it strange, but with us the occurrence is a common one. Believe me we have 'sons of God' in nearly all our villages."

Thus, with the Shiites, extremes meet. No Moslems more readily adapt themselves to the superficial atheisms of Europe than do the Persians, and none are more ardently devout, as all who have witnessed the miracle play of the two Imams will be obliged to admit. Extremes, too, of morality are seen, fierce asceticisms and gross licentiousnesses. By no sect of Islam is the duty of pilgrimage more religiously observed, or the prayers and ablutions required by their rule performed with a stricter ritual. But the very pilgrims who go on foot to Mecca scruple not to drink wine there, and Persian morality is everywhere a by-word. In all these circumstances there is much to fear as well as to hope on the side of the Shiite sect; but their future only indirectly involves that of Islam proper. Their whole census does not probably exceed fifteen millions, and it shows no tendency to increase. Outside Persia we find about one million Irâki Arabs, a few in Syria and Afghanistan, and at most five million in India. One small group still maintains itself in the neighbourhood of Medina, where it is tolerated rather than acknowledged, and a few Shiites are to be found in most of the large cities of the west, but everywhere the sect of Ali stands apart from and almost in a hostile attitude to the rest of Islam. It is noticeable, however, that within the last fifty years the religious bitterness of Shiite and Sunite is sensibly in decline.

The next most important of the heretical sects is the Abadiyeh. "These, according to some, are the religious descendants of the Kawarij, a sect which separated itself from the Khalifate in the time of the Seyid Ali, and, after a severe persecution in Irak, took refuge at last in Oman. Whatever their present doctrines, they seem at first to have been like the Shiites, political schismatics. They maintained that any Mussulman, so long as he was not affected with heresy, might be chosen Imam, and that he might be deposed for heresy or ill-conduct, and indeed that there was no absolute necessity for any Imam at all. They are at present only found in Oman and Zanzibar where they number, it is said, about four millions. Till as

late as the last century the Imamate was an elective office among them, but with the accession of the Abu Saïd dynasty it became hereditary in that family.¹ They reject all communion with the Sunites, but I have not been able to discover that they hold any doctrines especially offensive to the mass of Moslems. Their differences are mainly negative, and consist in the rejection of Khalifal history and authority later than the reign of Omar, and of a vast number of traditions now incorporated in the Sunite faith.

Allied to them but, as I understood, separate, are the Zeïdites of Yemen, who are possibly also descended from the Khawarij. But, as the Zeïdites are accustomed to conceal the fact of their heresy and to pass themselves when on pilgrimage as Sunites, I could learn little about them. They were, till ten years ago, independent under the Imams of Sana, and it is certain that they repudiate the Khalifate. In former times, before the first conquest of Arabia by the Turks, these Imams were all powerful in Hejaz, and on the destruction of the Bagdad Khalifate assumed the title of Hami el Hareameyn, protector of the holy places. The Turks, however, now occupy Sana, and the office of Imam is in abeyance. The Zeïdites can hardly number more than two millions, and their only importance in the future lies in the fact of their geographical proximity to Mecca, and in the fact that their sympathies lie on the side of liberality in opinion and reform in morals. Neither Zeïdites nor Abadites have any adherents out of their own countries.

Of the Wahhabites a more detailed account is needed, as although their numbers are small and their political importance less than it formerly was, the spirit of their reform movement still lives and exercises a potent influence on modern Mohammedan ideas. I have described elsewhere² the historical vicissitudes of the sect in Arabia, and the decline of its fortunes in Nejd, but a brief recapitulation of these may be allowed me. The early half of the last century was a period of religious stagnation in Islam, almost as much as it was in Christendom. Faith, morals, and religious practice were at the lowest ebb among Mussulmans, and it seemed to Europeans who looked on as though the faith of Mecca had attained its dotage, and was giving place to a non-curantist infidelity. Politically and religiously the Mussulman world was asleep, when suddenly it awoke, and like a young giant refreshed stood once more erect in Arabia. The reform preached by Abd el Wahhab was radical. He began by breaking with the maxim held by the mass of the orthodox that inquiry on matters of faith was closed. He constituted himself a new mujtahed and founded a new school, neither Hanafite, Malokite, nor Shafite, and called it the school of the Unitarians, Muwahheddin, a name still

(1) Compare Dr. Badger's *History of Oman* and Sale's *Koran*.

(2) Lady Anne Blunt's *Pilgrimage to Nejd*. Appendix.

cherished by the Wahhabites. He rejected positively all traditions but those of the companions of the Prophet, and he denied the claims of any but the first four Caliphs to have been legitimately elected. The Koran was to be the only written law, and Islam was to be again what it had been in the first decade of its existence. He established it politically in Nejd on precisely its old basis at Medina, and sought to extend it over the whole of Arabia, perhaps of the world. I believe it is hardly now recognised by Mohammedans how near Abd el Wahhab was to complete success. Before the close of the eighteenth century the chiefs of the Ibn Saouds, champions of Unitarian Islam, had established their authority over all Northern Arabia as far as the Euphrates, and in 1808 they took Mecca and Medina. In the meanwhile the Wahhabite doctrines were gaining ground still further afield. India was at one time very near conversion, and in Egypt, and North Africa, and even in Turkey many secretly subscribed to the new doctrines. Two things, however, marred the plan of general reform and prevented its full accomplishment. In the first place the reform was too completely reactive. It took no account whatever of the progress of modern thought, and directly it attempted to leave Arabia it found itself face to face with difficulties which only political as well as religious success could overcome. It was impossible, except by force of arms, to Arabianise the world again, and nothing less than this was in contemplation. Its second mistake, and that was one that a little of the Prophet's prudence which always went hand in hand with his zeal might have avoided, was a too rigid insistence upon trifles. Abd el Wahhab condemned minarets and tombstones because neither were in use during the first years of Islam. The minarets therefore were everywhere thrown down, and when the holy places of Hejaz fell into the hands of his followers the tombs of saints which had for centuries been revered as objects of pilgrimage were levelled to the ground. Even the Prophet's tomb at Medina was laid waste and the treasures it contained distributed among the soldiers of Ibn Saoud. This roused the indignation of all Islam, and turned the tide of the Wahhabite fortunes. Respectable feeling which had hitherto been on their side now declared itself against them, and they never after regained their position as moral and social reformers. Politically, too, it was the cause of their ruin. The outside Mussulman world, looking upon them as sacrilegious barbarians, was afraid to visit Mecca, and the pilgrimage declined so rapidly that the Hejazi became alarmed. The source of their revenue they found cut off, and it seemed on the point of ceasing altogether. Then they appealed to Constantinople, urging the Sultan to vindicate his claim to be protector of the holy places. What followed is well known. After the peace of Paris Sultan

Mahmud commissioned Mehomet Ali to deliver Mecca and Medina from the Wahhabite heretics, and this he in time effected. The war was carried into Nejd; Deriyeh, their capital, was sacked, and Ibn Saoud himself taken prisoner and decapitated in front of St. Sophia at Constantinople. The movement of reform in Islam was thus put back for, perhaps, another hundred years.

Still the seed cast by Abd el Wahhab has not been entirely without fruit. Wahhabism, as a political regeneration of the world, has failed, but the spirit of reform has remained. Indeed, the present unquiet attitude of expectation in Islam has been its indirect result. Just as the Lutheran reformation in Europe, though it failed to convert the Christian Church, caused its real reform, so Wahhabism has produced a real desire for reform if not yet reform itself in Mussulmans. Islam is no longer asleep, and were another and a wiser Abd'el Wahhab to appear, not as a heretic, but in the body of the Orthodox sect, he might play the part of Loyola or Borromeo with success.

The present condition of the Wahhabites as a sect is one of decline. In India, and I believe in other parts of Southern Asia, their missionaries still make converts and their preachers are held in high esteem. But at home in Arabia their zeal has waxed cold, giving place to liberal ideas which in truth are far more congenial to the Arabian mind. The Ibn Saoud dynasty no longer holds the first position in Nejd, and Ibn Rashid who has taken their place, though nominally a Wahhabite, has little of the Wahhabite fanaticism. He is in fact a popular and national rather than a religious leader, and though still designated at Constantinople as a pestilent heretic, is counted as their ally by the more liberal Sunites. It is probable that he would not withhold his allegiance from a Caliph of the legitimate house of Koroysh. But this, too, is beyond the subject of my present paper.

With the Wahhabites, then, our census of Islam closes. It has given us, as I hope, a fairly accurate view of the forces which make up the Mohammedan world, and though the enumeration of these cannot but be dull work, I do not think it will have been work done in vain. Without it indeed it would be almost impossible to make clear the problem presented to us by modern Islam or guess its solution. More interesting matter, however, lies before us, and in my next paper I propose to introduce my reader to that burning question of the day in Asia, the Caliphate, and explain the position of the House of Othman towards the Mohammedan world.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

LEIGH HUNT AS A POET.

"I HAVE not shovelled my verses out by cartloads, leaving the public, much less another generation, to save me the trouble of selection. I do not believe that other generations will take the trouble to rake for jewels in much nobler dust than mine. Posterity is too rich and idle. The only hope I can have of coming into anyone's hands, and exciting his attention beyond the moment, is by putting my workmanship, such as it is, into the best and compactest state." Such is the modest declaration prefixed by Leigh Hunt to a collection of his poems published in 1832, and containing, as he says, not above a third of the verses he had written. That he was decidedly overscrupulous in winnowing his own productions is abundantly clear. The intercession, for example, of a "partial friend" (probably Keats) was found necessary to procure the insertion of the beautiful sonnet on the Nile :—

"It flows through old hushed Egypt and its sands
Like some grave mighty thought threading a dream,
And times and things, as in that vision, seem
Keeping along it their eternal stands,—
Caves, pillars, pyramids, the shepherd bands
That roamed through the young earth, the glory extreme
Of high Sesostriis, and that southern beam,
The laughing queen that caught the world's great hands.

"Then comes a mightier silence, stern and strong,
As of a world left empty of its throng,
And the void weighs on us ; and then we wake,
And hear the fruitful stream lapsing along
"Twixt villages, and think how we shall take
Our own calm journey on for human sake."

Of a poem entitled *The Nymphs* he retained only a few passages. Yet of this poem Shelley wrote, "What a delightful poem *The Nymphs* is ! especially the second part. It is truly *poetical* in the intense and emphatic sense of the word." This does not read like an insincerity of friendship. In point of fact, Leigh Hunt was far too keen a critic to take pleasure in the manufacture of what he used to call "*heart and impart verses*." But in the meantime, before any question arises of "raking in the dust" of Leigh Hunt's poetry, one is arrested by the more initial misgiving, whether the verses which he himself was willing to believe worth reading have not unjustly lost the ear of the world. That no author can be written up or down except by himself, is a truism which he endorses in his autobiography ;

but on the other hand, no man can write himself up if he be out of print, and it may be suspected that many forgotten worthies are left in that limbo by the mere oscitancy of publishers. The public ought to be, and no doubt is, duly grateful for the convenient existing edition of much of Leigh Hunt's prose, but his poems are now not very easily obtainable in England. America has shown herself more appreciative. Perhaps a short consideration of his special excellencies as a poet may help to recall attention to writings which deserve at all events to be easily accessible.

Leigh Hunt made a very early appearance as a writer of verse. In the year 1801, when he was only sixteen, a collection of his boyish poems was published under the title of "*Juvenilia*," and ran through no less than four editions. The most interesting thing in connection with this early volume is the observation made upon it by Byron to the author, on the occasion of their first meeting. "He told me that the sight of my volume at Harrow had been one of his incentives to write verses, and that he had had the same passion for friendship as I had displayed in it. To my astonishment he quoted some of the lines, and would not hear me speak ill of them." For the rest, it is candidly and correctly described in Leigh Hunt's own words, as "a heap of imitations all but absolutely worthless. I wrote odes, because Collins and Gray had written them, pastorals, because Pope had written them, 'blank verse,' because Akenside and Thomson had written blank verse, and a *Palace of Pleasure*, because Spenser had written a *Bower of Bliss*. I had nobody to bid me go to the Nature which had originated the books." We have the usual Pantheon of abstractions, from "*Animation*" to "*Panting Asthma*," the customary felicitations of "*Dobson, happy swain*;" and the no less customary denunciations of the "*sceptred Nero's*" and "*purpled wretches*" whose lot is cast otherwise. As for the versification it answers for the most part to the humorous description afterwards put by Leigh Hunt into the mouth of Apollo in the *Feast of the Poets* :—

"So ever since Pope, my pet bard of the town,
Set a tune with his verses, half up and half down,
There has been such a doting and sameness—by Jove!
I'd as soon have gone down to see Kemble in love!"

How thoroughly Leigh Hunt outgrew this and the other false ideals of his boyhood the lines quoted partly bear witness, nor would it be worth while to dwell on his artificial immaturities, were it not for the influence which his early tastes had upon his subsequent poetical practice. His addiction in boyhood to the school of Pope enabled him to view in after years with a genial catholicity of appreciation the wit and eloquence which Bowles and others set the fashion of unduly decrying. It is probable that none are fitted to

appreciate the eighteenth century writers but those to whom their very verbiage has a certain charm of association. No one-sided sentiment of reaction against our so-called Augustan literature disqualified Leigh Hunt from becoming, as he afterwards became, the greatest master since the days of Dryden of that heroic couplet, which had become to most minds indissolubly associated with the prosaic versification of the eighteenth century school.

It seems clear that Dryden's successors, by accentuating the one defect of his versification as a whole,—his "beating too much upon the rhyme,"—withdrew the attention of the great poets of the beginning of this century from the infinite capabilities of the couplet as Dryden used it. Pope, from an accurate perception where his own strength lay, and Pope's followers, from a blind submission to his authority, or from an ear defective or untrained, were fully persuaded that in discarding triplets and alexandrines, eschewing dissyllabic rhymes, and adopting a see-saw balance of rhythm, they had effected an undoubted improvement; while the great poets of the early part of the nineteenth century either allowed themselves to fall in with this long-standing superstition, as did Byron; or discarded the couplet in disgust, as did Coleridge, and for the most part Shelley; or, finally, ran headlong with Keats into an opposite and equally artificial extreme. "The great fault of *Endymion*," observes Leigh Hunt with his usual acuteness in such matters, "next to its unpruned luxuriance (or before it rather, for it was not a fault on the right side) was the wilfulness of its rhymes. The author had a just contempt for the monotonous termination of everyday couplets; he broke up his lines in order to distribute the rhyme properly; but, going only on the ground of his contempt, and not having yet settled with himself any principle of versification, the very exuberance of his ideas led him to make use of the first rhymes that offered; so that, by a new meeting of extremes, the effect was as artificial, and much more obtrusive, than the one under the old system. Dryden modestly confessed that a rhyme had often helped him to a thought. Mr. Keats, in the tyranny of his wealth, forced his rhymes to help him whether they would or not; and they obeyed him, in the most singular manner, with equal promptitude and ungainliness."

Few in these days, now that we have long ceased to be harassed with the monotony of eighteenth-century verse, will dispute the justice of this verdict, or be slow to acknowledge that the fashion set by *Endymion* has produced a quantity of couplets of a very tiresome and unmusical description. The old workmanship was at all events neat and conscientious as far as it went, nor was a poetic genius required to make it pass muster. The old-fashioned couplet could be handled on occasion by such prose-giants as Bentley without

serious disaster. A poet of the last century complacently observed that—

“—he who runs may read, while well he knows
I write in metre what he thinks in prose.”

This was all very well; but when we find nowadays some unqualified aspirant adopting the couplet of Keats, it is a very different matter. “*Musæ furcillis præcipitem ejiciunt.*” It was formerly held that lines of unequal lengths must certainly be Pindaric, and there seems to be a tendency to hold now, that lines which escape monotony must certainly be harmonious. The tamest verse is perhaps ill-exchanged for prose run mad.

The *Story of Rimini*, Leigh Hunt's first serious poem of importance, and written in the ten-syllable couplet, was published in 1816, with a preface advocating the still unpopular theories of poetry upheld by Wordsworth sixteen years before in his famous *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads*. But it is observable that Leigh Hunt's instinctive critical insight kept him clear of the mistake into which his great predecessor had fallen, in looking to an unlettered peasantry for poetical language. “The proper language of poetry is in fact nothing different from that of real life, and depends for its dignity on the strength and sentiment of what it speaks.” Thus far they are agreed. But Leigh Hunt goes on, “It is only adding *musical modulation* to what a *fine understanding* might naturally utter in the midst of its griefs or enjoyments.” We have here just the two vital points on which Wordsworth, in his capacity of critic, had failed to insist. A quotation from the *Story of Rimini* will exemplify what has been said with respect to versification, and present to those who may be unfamiliar with Leigh Hunt's poetry some slight notion of its distinctive character. Literary criticism without quotation is indeed “*vescum papaver*”—at once innutritious and soporific. An adequate idea cannot, however, be conveyed, without more copious citation than will here be possible, since much of the beauty of the poem consists in the unembarrassed vivacity of transition with which the story is made to move before the reader—the affluent vigour of invention with which picture after picture is touched in before his eyes. This art of telling a story is rare in English poetry. Even considerable poets will seem at times, when occupied with narrative, to flag and loiter, to dwell, as it were, in their stride; their notion, to vary the metaphor, is not so much a triumphal progress as a series of bivouacks. In the *Story of Rimini* succession seems to be reconciled with continuity, and every new surprise of fancy comes upon the reader with the satisfying force of an iteration. To prove this would be to quote a whole canto. Fortunately, there is scarcely a passage which is not sufficiently picturesque in detail to suffer detachment.

" 'Tis nature, full of spirits waked and springing :—
 The birds to the delicious time are singing,
 Darting with freaks and snatches up and down,
 Where the light woods go seaward from the town ;
 While happy faces, striking through the green
 Of leafy roads, at every turn are seen ;
 And the far ships, lifting their sails of white
 Like joyful hands, come up with scattery light,
 Come gleaming up, true to the wished-for day.
 And chase the whistling brine, and swirl into the bay.

" Already in the streets the stir grows loud
 Of joy increasing and a bustling crowd.
 With feet and voice the gathering hum contends,
 Yearns the deep talk, the ready laugh ascends :
 Callings, and clapping doors, and curs unite,
 And shouts from mere exuberance of delight,
 And armed hands, making important way,
 Gallant and grave, the lords of holiday,
 And nodding neighbours, greeting as they run,
 And pilgrims chanting in the morning sun.

" With heaved-out tapestry the windows glow,
 By lovely faces brought, that come and go ;
 Till, the work smoothed, and all the street attired,
 They take their seats, with upward gaze admired ;
 Some looking down, some forwards or aside,
 Some readjusting tresses newly tied,
 Some turning a trim waist, or o'er the flow
 Of crimson cloths hanging a hand of snow ;
 But all with smiles prepared, and garlands green,
 And all in fluttering talk impatient for the scene."

There is here an *abandon*, an hilarity, a glad acceptance of the pleasure and beauty to be found in trifles, to parallel which in England we have to go back to the poets more immediately under Italian influence, and to express one aspect of which we have been forced to borrow an Italian word—*gusto*. This spirit has now become so alien to our literature, the poetry of pure high spirits without any "undercurrent woe" is a thing so rare, that it is perhaps not surprising if it fails to meet with ready recognition. Leigh Hunt himself was fond of attributing his cheerfulness to the West Indian blood in his veins, and accounted in this way for the more cordial reception his poems met with in America. In England his "animal spirits" were set down in many or most critical quarters to mere affectation, especially when they manifested themselves in any verbal eccentricities. Gifford in the *Quarterly* fell with rabid violence on such expressions as "scattery light." Gifford, it is true, was one of the "critics who themselves are sore," having been made ridiculous in the *Feast of the Poets* ; but other judges, who had less reason to be biassed, concurred in his strictures. Leigh Hunt accordingly altered this and other offending phrases in subsequent

editions. Unfortunately, he further allowed himself to be criticized out of such expressions as "freaks and snatches," to which no one would now think of demurring. And yet more unfortunately, he was induced to give up a considerable number of dissyllabic rhymes. The first couplet in the passage quoted he altered as follows:—

"Tis nature, full of spirits, waked and loved,—
E'en sloth to-day goes quick and unproved—"

lines pleasant in themselves, but how inferior to those which they supplant!

"Tis nature, full of spirits, waked and springing,
The birds to the delicious time are singing,—"

The hypermetric syllables here are like the first hurried notes of the birds themselves, impatient to get into the thick of their own music.

The excellently realistic lines—

"Callings, and clapping doors, and curs unite,
And shouts from mere exuberance of delight—"

he also sacrificed to I know not what stilted folly of censorship. Over-diffidence in self-criticism was perhaps natural to one who occupied himself so much with the study of masterpieces; but it is none the less lamentable to find him making such concessions as these to the requirements of a theory even then obsolescent. To those who are tempted to think that diffidence in a poet is its own justification, it may be sufficient to recall the preface to *Endymion*. Most of the quotations here made I have ventured to give as they stood in the earlier editions.

Leigh Hunt took pleasure in identifying passages in his favourite Spenser with the names of great painters whose works they recalled, Titian, Claude, or Raphael. His own poetry is itself intensely pictorial, so much so, that he was accused, oddly enough, of transferring images direct from canvass; as if looking at a cattle-piece made it easier to hit off in words the

"Cattle, looking up askance
With ruminant meek mouths, and sleepy glance."

Among numberless instances of such graphic effects take the following of swans, occurring in a description of Naiads:—

"Others pass
Nodding and smiling in the middle tide,
And luring swans on, which like fondled things
Eye poutingly their hands; yet following, glide
With unsuperfluous lift of their proud wings."

Or this of eagles:—

“Eagles on their rocks,
With straining feet, *and that fierce mouth and drear*
Answering the strain with downward drag austere.”

Or this of a fountain :—

“And in the midst, fresh whistling through the scene,
A lightsome fountain starts from out the green,
Clear and compact, till at its height o’errun
It shakes its loosening silver in the sun.”

Or this of bees with its felicitous verb :—

“Then issues forth the bee to *clutch* the thyme.”

Or this, with its pleasant union of Virgilian reminiscence and direct observation, but in which the poetry, as indeed generally happens, gets beyond the reach of painting :—

“But Autumn now was over, and the crane
Began to clang against the coming rain,
And peevish winds ran cutting o’er the sea,
Which oft returned a face of enmity.”

Or this which recalls a passage in *Tears, idle Tears* :—

“And when the casement, at the dawn of light,
Began to show a square of ghastly white.”

Or this of a thunder-cloud :—

“Sloping its dusky ladders of thick rain.”

How vivid again is this description of a winter’s evening :—

“Nought heard through all our little lulled abode,
Save the crisp fire, or leaf of book turned o’er,
Or watch-dog, or the ring of frosty road.”

Leigh Hunt felt and expressed the commonest sights and sounds in this minute and forcible fashion, as when he speaks in his *Autobiography* of the “mud-shine” on the pavement in front of a theatre at night, or describes how—

“Childhood I saw, glad-faced, that squeezeth tight
One’s hand, *while the rapt curtain soars away.*”

There is a theory propounded in *Rasselas* to the effect that the business of the poet is to remark only “general properties and large appearances. He does not number the streaks of the tulip, or describe the different shades in the verdure of the forest.” He must “neglect the minuter discriminations for those characteristics which are alike obvious to vigilance and carelessness.” The statement, as might have been expected from its authorship, goes somewhat too far, but the theory itself is perhaps not altogether unsound. The difficulty of course is to determine what may be

considered to amount to vigilance or carelessness in observation. There are, however, undoubted instances in poetry of a tendency to mistake the discursive knowledge of the naturalist for the unifying emotion of the poet, and to adopt a theory which would make the admirable author of the *Gamekeeper at Home* potentially as great a poet as Keats. Leigh Hunt is never obnoxious to criticism of this kind. To be aware, for instance, of the truth of the following passage, it is enough to have walked in the streets; to feel it thus intensely, to utter it thus felicitously, was assuredly to be no inconsiderable poet.

“His haughty stood, that seems by turns to be
Vexed and made proud by that cool mastery,
Shakes at his bit, and rolls his eyes with care,
Reaching with stately step at the fine air;
And now and then, sidelining his restless pace,
Drops with his hinder legs, and shifts his place,
And feels through all his frame a fiery thrill;
The princely rider on his back sits still,
And looks where'er he likes, and sways him at his will.”

The last three lines are a fine example of Leigh Hunt's remark that the triplet “enables a poet to finish his impulse with triumph.” He characteristically adds: “I confess I like the very bracket that marks out the triplet to the reader's eye, and prepares him for the music of it. It has a look like the bridge of a lute.”

There are other lines descriptive of horses in the *Story of Rimini* to the full as good as those quoted; but enough perhaps has been said of Leigh Hunt's mastery of the picturesque. Word-painting is an art not always looked upon with favour by the austere votaries of form. To those who have a keen sense of niceties of language, it must, however, be always a source of the intensest pleasure. A certain measure of attraction it will retain, even when it borders on mere ingenuity, but when it rises upon the wings of its own self-delight into the higher levels of emotion, theories can touch it no longer. “The general consent and delight of poetic readers” is, after all, the only true touch-stone of poetry. It seems a deplorably indefinite standard, but a better has yet to be found.

The following passage, called by Leigh Hunt “Ariadne waking, a Fragment,” will exemplify the delicacy of the gradation between poetry merely picturesque and poetry in its more spiritual forms:—

“The moist and quiet morn was scarcely breaking,
When Ariadne in her bower was waking;
Her eyelids still were closing, and she heard
But indistinctly yet a little bird,
That in the leaves o'erhead, waiting the sun,
Seemed answering another distant one.
She waked but stirred not, only just to please
Her pillow-nestling cheek; while the full seas,

The birds, the leaves, the lulling love o'ernight,
 The happy thought of the returning light,
 The sweet, self-willed content, conspired to keep
 Her senses lingering in the feel of sleep ;
 And with a little smile she seemed to say,
 ' I know my love is near me, and 'tis day.' "

Though there is here no word-painting properly so called, there is not a line that is not purely descriptive, yet the subdued rapture of the treatment moves the reader in a way which might have been thought impossible to descriptive poetry.

Our next quotation shall be from the "Lines to T. L. H., six years old, during a sickness :"—

" Thy sidelong pillowed meekness,
 Thy thanks to all that aid,
 Thy heart in pain and weakness
 Of fancied faults afraid ;
 The little trembling hand
 That wipes thy quiet tears,
*These, these are things that may demand
 Dread memories for years.*

" To say ' He has departed '—
 ' His voice '—' his face '—is gone ;
 To feel impatient-hearted,
 Yet feel we must bear on ;
*Ah, I could not endure
 To whisper of such woe,
 Unless I felt this sleep ensure
 That it will not be so.*"

The metre here used, with its quick recurrence of rhyme and heavy equability of accent, is finely adopted for the utterance of the emotion which is as placid as despair. Giovanni's lament over his brother's body in the *Story of Rimini* is conceived with a similar emphasis of sorrow.

" But noble passion touched Giovanni's soul ;
 He seemed to feel the clouds of habit roll
 Away from him at once, with all their scorn ;
 And out he spoke, in the clear air of morn :—
 ' By heaven, by heaven, and all the better part
 Of us poor creatures with a human heart,
 I trust we reap at last, as well as plough ;—
 But there, meantime, my brother, liest thou ;
 And, Paulo, thou wert the completest knight,
 That ever rode with banner to the fight ;
 And thou wert the most beautiful to see,
 That ever came in press of chivalry ;
 And of a simple man thou wert the best,
 That ever for his friend put spear in rest ;
 And thou wert the most meek and cordial,
 That ever among ladies eat in hall ;
 And thou wert still, for all that bosom gored,
 The kindest man that ever struck with sword.' "

Most of the phraseology of this passage is taken from an old romance, but few, in the face of ancient and modern precedent, will think the less of it on that account. The concluding lines of the sonnet on Kosciusko are yet more loftily and directly impressive.

“There came a wanderer, borne from land to land
Upon a couch, pale, many-wounded, mild,
His brow with patient pain dulcetly sour.
Men stooped, with awful sweetness, on his hand,
And kissed it; and collected *Virtue smiled,*
To think how sovereign her enduring hour.”

The description of Giovanni in the *Story of Rimini* is interesting apart from its cleverness, inasmuch as Lady Byron appears to have told her husband with considerable candour, and probably with no less insight, that it reminded her of his own character.

“Bold, handsome, able, if he choso, to please,
Punctual and right in common offices,
He lost the sight of conduct's only worth,
The scattering smiles on this uneasy earth,
And on the strength of virtues of small weight,
Claimed towards himself the exercise of great.
He kept no reckoning with his sweets and sour,
He'd hold a sullen countenance for hours,
And then, if pleased to cheer himself a space,
Look for the immediate rapture in your face,
And wonder that a cloud could still be there,
How small soever, when his own was fair.
Yet such is conscience, so designed to keep
Stern central watch, while all things else go sleep,
That no suspicion would have touched him more
Than that of wanting on the generous score:
He would have whelmed you with a weight of scorn,
Been proud at eve, inflexible at morn,
In short, ungenerous for a week to come,
And all to strike that desperate error dumb.”

This lacks the condensation of the characters of Achitophel or Atticus, but it is hardly less subtle and lifelike. The following is in a lighter vein :—

“There lived knight, when knighthood was in flower,
Who charmed alike the tilt-yard and the bower ;
Young, handsome, blithe, loyal and brave of course,
He stuck as firmly to his friend as horse ;
And only showed, for so complete a youth,
Somewhat too perfect a regard for truth ;
He owned 'twas inconvenient, sometimes felt
A wish 'twere buckled in another's belt,
Doubted its modesty, its use, its right,—
Yet, after all, remained the same true knight.
So potent is a custom early taught,
And to such straits may honest men be brought.”

The fresh and quiet humour of the last couplet is as pleasant as
VOL. XXX. N.S. R

one of Dryden's versions of Chaucer. But it is in the more airy exuberance of mirthful trifling that Leigh Hunt is specially at home. Take, for example, the lines "On seeing a Pigeon make love."

"Is not the picture strangely like?
Doesn't the very bowing strike?
Can any art of love in fashion
Express a more provailing passion?
That air—that sticking to her side,—
That deference, ill-concealing pride,—
That seeming consciousness of coat,
And repetition of one note,—
Ducking and tossing back his head,
As if at every bow he said,
'Madam, by heaven,' or 'Strike me dead!'

And then the lady! look at her:
What bridling sense of character!
How she declines and seems to go,
Yet still endures him to and fro;
Carrying her plumes and pretty clothings,
Blushing stare, and muttered nothings,
Body plump, and airy feet,
Like any charmer in a street.

Give him a hat beneath his wing,
And is not he the very thing?
Give her a parasol or plaything,
And is not she the very she-thing?"

A reviewer in the *Athenæum* some time ago, after quoting with due appreciation Leigh Hunt's line "April, with his white hands wet with flowers," added that Leigh Hunt was "decidedly not a great poet." This is no doubt the current opinion, as far as an opinion on the point is current at all. Yet it is difficult to be quite sure, firstly, on what such opinions are based, and secondly, what measure of depreciation they are intended to imply.

*"And collected Virtue smiled,
To think how sovereign her enduring hour."*

Few will deny this to be great poetry in any or every sense of the word, full of solemnity and sobriety, and having a special character and music of its own. Probably what is meant is, that such lines are not sufficiently frequent in Leigh Hunt; that the "application of great ideas to life," which we are now given to understand is the proper business of the poet, is for the most part ignored. Even in the hands of their first authors, these theories of the moral purpose in poetry are apt to become the merest dogmatism. Was Milton, for example, in the wrong, when he delighted in a poem so completely unmoral as the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid? And, on the other hand, when these theories "descend into the street," instead of helping the average reader to attend to something which he might

otherwise be prone to neglect, they rather tend to confirm him in the desperate condition of the frequenters of the galleries of our theatres, who, as many may lately have had occasion to observe, applaud Cassio's diatribes against drinking with more warmth than anything else in *Othello*.

Leigh Hunt's own opinion on this matter may be inferred from his judgment of Coleridge's poetry, that it was "on the whole the finest of its time, that is to say, the most quintessential, the most purely emanating from imaginative feeling, unadulterated by 'thoughts' and manner."

Or let us hear him in verse :—

"And he's the poet, more or less, who knows
The charm that hallows the least truth from prose,
And dresses it in its mild singing clothes."

An exquisite line, which could scarcely be attributed to any one but Leigh Hunt, and which bears us refreshingly away from the neighbourhood of the discontented criticism which refuses to take books as it finds them.

Leigh Hunt's own estimate of his poetical status was the reverse of overweening, but shows his usual discrimination. "I please myself with thinking, that had the circumstances of my life permitted it, I might have done something a little worthier of acceptance in the way of a mixed kind of narrative poetry, part lively and part serious, somewhere between the longer poems of the Italians, and the fabliaux of the old French. My propensity would have been (and oh! had my duties permitted, how willingly would I have passed my life in it! how willingly now pass it!) to write 'eternal new stories' in verse, of no great length, but just sufficient to vent the pleasure with which I am stung on meeting with some touching adventure, and which haunts me till I can speak of it somehow. I would have dared to pretend to be a servant in the train of Ariosto, nay, of Chaucer,

'—and far off his skirts adore.' "

As it is, his best poetical work is limited in quantity, and he must be included in the long list of poets whose infertility is a stock grievance. As he makes Apollo lament—

"There's Collins, it's true, had a good deal to say,
But the dog had no industry, neither had Gray,"—

and the same might be said even more truly of Coleridge and others. On Leigh Hunt's part there was no lack of industry; but his amiable eagerness to leave the world better than he found it, beguiled him into the then dangerous path of political journalism, brought him into collision with the law of libel, and was every way unfavourable

to free poetical activity. It would be hasty and ungrateful to affirm that the world is none the better for his struggles and sufferings. It may be believed, for instance, that every ill-judged prosecution for libel must have forwarded the legitimate freedom of the press. And if the good that a man does may in any degree be measured by the abuse that he gets for doing it, Leigh Hunt must be ranked very high amongst reformers. "He will live and die," wrote Gifford, in reviewing his poems, "unhonoured in his own generation; and for his own sake it is to be hoped, moulder unknown in those which are to follow." One cannot but feel that "a very clever, a very honest, and a very good-natured man," to quote Macaulay's description of Leigh Hunt, must have done good to an extent very considerable indeed, to be written of in this fashion.

His occupations as a critic further contributed to withdraw Leigh Hunt from poetry, but this was a distraction scarcely to be regretted. The pleasure of hearing the judgments of a poet on fine specimens of his own art is rare enough to reconcile us to the loss of a certain proportion of his own poetical work, especially when the criticism is not of that barren sort which disdains to dwell upon minutiae of style. In order to be fully alive to the improvement brought about in popular taste by Leigh Hunt's criticism, it should be remembered that it appeared in days when the criticism in vogue was of the following sort. "The very essence of versification is uniformity; and while anything like versification is preserved, it is evident that uniformity continues to be aimed at. What pleasure is to be derived from an occasional failure in this aim, we cannot exactly understand. It must afford the same gratification, we should imagine, to have one of the buttons on a coat a little larger than the rest, or one or two of the pillars of a colonnade a little out of the perpendicular."

It was against facetious incompetence of this kind that Leigh Hunt defended Keats; in the words of the criticism of the day, "it was he who first puffed the youth into notice in his newspaper." And, to give another example, we have lately been reminded that he was one of the first to welcome the sonnets of Mr. Tennyson Turner. Leigh Hunt was in fact the leader of a school of poetry and criticism, in which Keats was looked upon as a neophyte; which Byron accused of corrupting the taste of Barry Cornwall, and which was called the cockney school, apparently from a notion that daisies ceased to be daisies when they grew at Hampstead.

Leigh Hunt also occupied himself a good deal with translation, chiefly from the Italian poets, and incurred remonstrances from Shelley on the point. "I am sorry to hear," Shelley wrote, "that you have employed yourself in translating *Aminta*, though I doubt not it will be a just and beautiful translation. You ought to exercise your fancy in the perpetual creation of new forms of gentle-

ness and beauty." Yet here, too, there are compensations. The following, for example, from Martial, is as good as a morsel of Herrick :—

"Underneath this greedy stone
Lies little sweet Erotion,
Whom the Fates, with hearts as cold,
Nipped away at six years old.
Thou, whoever thou may'st be,
That hast this small field after me,
Let the yearly rites be paid
To her little slender shado ;
So shall no disease or jar
Hurt thy house, or chill thy Lar ;
But this tomb here be alone,
The only melancholy stone."

Leigh Hunt also excelled, as might have been expected, in the rendering of playful passages, such as those in the *Bacchus in Tuscany*, or the *Confessions of Goliath*.

"I devise to end my days in a tavern drinking,
May some Christian hold for me the glass when I am shrinking,
That the Cherubim may cry, when they see me sinking,
God be merciful to a soul of this gentleman's way of thinking."

I have purposely selected for quotation this urbane version of somewhat hackneyed lines, as it seems to have been ousted in text-books of literature and history—for example, in Mr. Green's "Short History"—by a dull ridiculous quatrain ending, "God have mercy on this sot, the angels will begin,"—an utterance purely savage and shocking without any touch of pleasantry. No one will doubt that the original is conceived in a jocose vein, however serious the underlying intention may have been. Leigh Hunt found the lines in Camden's "Remains," and no doubt shared Camden's error with respect to the character of Walter Map.

ARMINE T. KENT.

THE LAND QUESTION IN EUROPE.

THE great French Revolution marks the commencement of a new era in the history of landed property in Europe, and its first great excesses may be traced to agrarian discontent. This arose chiefly from the pressure of feudal institutions, which had no longer any justification in the eyes of the peasant. The French peasants, with the exception of those in Brittany and Anjou, were not farmers in our sense of the word; they were small proprietors, subject to the payment of certain dues and fines, whose legal foundation was fiercely contested during the half century preceding the Revolution, and whose origin could not be explained before the Comparative Method of Inquiry came into use. The exasperation which was produced by the controversy and litigation about these feudal rights was the reason why the peasantry were from the first such enthusiasts for the destruction of the old institutions of the country, and explains much of the subsequent course of events. The feudal dues and privileges were abolished by the law of the 11th August, 1789, which embodied the resolutions which the National Assembly adopted during the famous night of the 4th. This law was passed with great precipitation, but the lords were to a great extent indemnified for their pecuniary loss. The Act of the 28th September, 1791, was a mere corollary to the above. It declared all landed property free from burdens, except those recognised by law; it gave the proprietors full liberty to do as they liked with the land, and to sell its products either within or without the confines of the kingdom, as they thought fit. The object of this legislation was simply to abolish institutions which had outlived their time; and its leading principles had been sanctioned by the royal edicts of 1774, 1775, and 1776, which were issued when Turgot was Comptroller-General.

Unfortunately the Revolution did not stop there. It would take me too far away from my subject to analyze the causes which led to the confiscation and sale of the Church property and of that belonging to those who fled the country. There is, however, no better established fact in history than that the number of proprietors in France was not increased in consequence. It has been proved over and over again that the division of landed property in that country does not date from the Revolution. Land belonging to persons who had emigrated was sold by the Revolutionary Government for about a milliard of francs. In the year 1825 the same sum was voted to indemnify the former owners; and the list drawn up for that purpose shows how minutely land was divided. There were a few who

received £40,000 and more, but many did not receive more than £40. Little lots, worth £5 and £2 10s., were sold in Alsace, and the average worth of the properties confiscated was £2,000.¹ The truth is, this attack upon property was the reason why France did not reap the full benefit of the legislation which destroyed feudalism. It was the direct cause of the civil war; the civil war led to the death of the King, and the death of the King to the European war.

“Das eben ist der Fluch der bösen That,
Dass sie, fortzeugend, immer Böses muss gebären.”

In the end it was the people, always the dupe of flatterers and demagogues, that most suffered. Civil disturbance and foreign war were raging at the same time; the western provinces were in flames, Lyons in revolt, and three hundred thousand persons in prison on mere suspicion. Bands of ruffians marched about the country, burning, murdering, and destroying. The result of all this was scarcity, which in its turn became a weapon in the hands of the revolutionists. The famous laws of the maximum were passed, and there was a regular famine. The people of Paris could not get bread without tickets from the municipal authorities; and the peasants, on the other hand, were obliged to send their corn to market whether they liked it or not, and sell it at a fixed price. In the midst of all this strife and confusion, speculators and land-jobbers had a fine time of it. They managed to acquire land very often for the fourth of its value; and if any one wishes to see to what a state of misery and destitution the peasantry were reduced in consequence, not of the destruction of the *ancien régime*, but of the violation of principles upon which all human society reposes, he has only to consult the reports of the commissions of inquiry issued by the Consular Government, and which were presided over by such men as Fourcroy, Barbé-Marbois, Français de Nantes, Lacuée, Thibaudau, Champagny, and Duchâtel.

But a portion of the responsibility must also rest with those who prevented timely and searching reform. There can be no doubt whatever that had Turgot, when Comptroller-General, been able to impose his policy on the country, the social and economic transformation of France would have taken place without strife and confusion.

In Prussia, under the guiding hand of Freiherr von Stein, the great change from the feudal organization to the modern state was accomplished in the most tranquil manner; no class in the country lost its self-respect, and there is no dismal record of blood and crime.

According to the old law of Prussia only noble persons could hold

(1) M. Léonce de Lavergne: *De l'Influence de la Révolution Française sur l'Agriculture*. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1858, p. 450.

what were called noble estates. Peasants could only hold peasant land, and there was a third kind of land which could only be held by citizens. The soil of the country might pass from hand to hand, but it must always remain in the possession of nobles, peasants, or citizens, as the case might be. The whole of the monarchy was organized on the model of the old manorial organization, and there were some serfs who paid dues in personal service. The King of Prussia had also very large domains. In the reign of King Frederic William I. serfdom was abolished on the royal domains of Prussia proper, but it continued to exist elsewhere. This was the agrarian system of the country, when the battles of Jena, Eylau, and Friedland brought the Prussian monarchy to the brink of ruin. King Frederic William III. felt it could only be saved by a man of genius, courage, and daring, and he found that man in Stein. Stein undertook the arduous task. One of the first acts of his ministry was to turn their attention to the question of agrarian reform. Agriculture had suffered very severely by the war; the landowners had lost their capital, their stock, and in many cases their farm-buildings. Stein made it his first business to remove all hindrances in the way of the landowner replacing his lost capital, and he therefore abolished all limitation of the right of owning and of alienating land. The status of the peasant was next done away with, and he became free to select any calling he thought fit. Anything like personal serfdom was put an end to, but all obligations, contracted by free persons in consequence of the possession of land, continued as before. The serfs were emancipated on all the royal domains, and some usual fines remitted. But the distress of the peasantry, caused by the war, was greatest on the royal domains in the Prussian provinces, where serfage had been abolished by the father of Frederic the Great. The peasantry on those domains had an hereditary right to their holdings, but they could not raise a mortgage nor sell them. They were wretchedly off; they tilled badly and were continually coming to the State for assistance. It had often been suggested that they should be turned into proprietors in fee simple, but their pauperised condition rendered this very difficult, and the matter was further complicated by the circumstance that the holdings were not separate, but grouped in commonalties very much like the system of rundale which exists in some parts of Ireland. A royal commission, on which sat such distinguished men as Niebuhr, Schön, Stägeman, and Altenstein, was issued to investigate the whole question. Most, if not all, its members were of opinion that these commonalties ought to be dissolved, and each peasant given his holding subject to certain dues. They also advised that the State should abstain absolutely from giving any assistance to these peasants, and that those who could not fulfil their obligations should be evicted. By this means it was

thought that gradually a better class of tenants might be obtained, to whom the full right of property in their holdings might be given, subject to a regular payment in money. The minister Schrötter made a somewhat different proposition. He concurred in the view that the State should abstain from giving help any longer, and he urged further that some of the privileges which these peasants enjoyed, such as the permission to send their cattle to graze in the royal forests, should be withdrawn. He then proposed that the payment in kind, for which they were liable, should be commuted into money and added to the rent. Of this sum one-quarter was to remain a permanent charge on the land, and the other three-quarters to be redeemable in thirty years. If any peasant was unable or declined to accept this arrangement, his holding was to be sold, and the proceeds of the sale given to him as compensation for disturbance. These were, in the main, the schemes which Stein had to consider. The interests of no less than 47,000 families were involved, and so upright and conscientious a man could not be but seriously impressed with the gravity of the situation. He ultimately decided on carrying out the proposals of Schrötter, but he continued the Government subsidies for two years, in order to give the tenants time to repair their holdings. In the year 1811 Hardenberg framed a law by which, on all manorial estates, the peasant became the owner of his holding, and the lord was compensated by receiving in fee simple a third of the peasant's land, if the latter held by hereditary tenure, and one-half if he did not. This is a brief outline of the agrarian legislation in Prussia at the beginning of this century.¹ The subsequent land legislation of the monarchy has generally been in the direction of helping the peasant to pay off his debt to the State. Its effect has been to create a free peasant proprietary, although that was not its main object. It was part of a great scheme for abolishing all monopolies and removing all impediments to industry in the Prussian nation, and any one may convince himself of this by simply reading the reports and memoranda of Hardenberg, Altenstein, and Schön.

The fines, dues, and monopolies of the feudal system continued to exist throughout Germany and Austria long after Stein had cleared them away in Prussia. In the Austrian Empire, however, some of the worst abuses of the old *régime* had been removed by Maria Theresa, and her son, the Emperor Joseph, was on the point of freeing the land from all feudal burdens, when he died on February 20th, 1790.

His successor was unable or unwilling to carry on his policy, and the old manorial organization remained in full vigour till 1848.

(1) The best information on the agrarian reforms of Stein will be found in Professor Seeley's life of that statesman. There is also a valuable pamphlet by Mr. Dix Hutton, *Prussia and Ireland*. Ridgway, 1867.

That portion of the law which affects the every-day interest of the people was administered in a court presided over nominally by the lord, but in reality by one of his officials, called *Gerichtshalter*, and corresponding to the *bailli* of the *ancien régime* in France. The manner in which justice was dispensed in these courts did not give general satisfaction, and disputes as to the amount of foudal dues had produced a considerable feeling of exasperation throughout South Germany, particularly in Baden, Würtemberg, and Hesse, and when the tempest of 1848 burst over Germany and Austria, it became a matter of necessity to sweep away the whole manorial organization, and, at the same time, to simplify the tenure and remove all impediments to the transfer of land. In the kingdom of Bavaria, where the question was dealt with more thoroughly, and perhaps, for that very reason, more equitably than in most states, with the exception of Austria and Saxony, the peasant held his land under one of four different kinds of tenure: *Erbrecht*, *Freistift*, *Leibrecht*, and *Neustift*. In the case of *Erbrecht*, when a tenant died his heir succeeded to the holding as a matter of right; but in the case of *Leibrecht* the lord might resume possession of the holding, and add it to his domain on the death of the tenant. Those who held by *Freistift* occupied their holdings at the will of the lord. The tenant might at any moment get notice to quit. But the lord was obliged to restore to him the fine he paid when he took possession, or the purchase-money if he had bought the good-will of another, and had also to make him full compensation for any improvements he might have made. In the case of *Neustift* the right of occupation terminated if the manor changed hands. For instance, if the lord died, or gave up the manor to his son, or sold it: in all these cases, when the right of occupation was renewed, a money payment, called *Laudemium*, had to be made to the lord, and in practice all these holdings, no matter under which of the four tenures they were held, passed from father to son for many generations. The tenant gave the lord every year a certain proportion of his corn, also a *Blutsehn*, which consisted of calves, poultry, &c., and a *Kleinsehn*, which was a proportion of his non-cereal crops. As a proprietary arrangement this had become exceedingly cumbrous and inconvenient; it produced many troubles and difficulties, and there was a general desire, not confined by any means to the peasant class, for a simpler agrarian system. In order to satisfy this want, a law was passed offering adequate remuneration to any lords of manors who chose to renounce their feudal dues. As may be imagined, it was not easy always to determine the value of manorial dues. It was therefore provided that State arbitrators might be called in when an agreement could not be come to. With regard to the fines, it was arranged that they should be trebled in the case of *Erbrecht* and *Freistift*, and doubled in the case of *Leibrecht*

and *Neustift*. The yearly dues in kind were commuted into money, and then the State offered, to any lord who chose to accept, twenty times the value of the total sum in Government securities at 4 per cent. Almost all the lords of the manors availed themselves of the Government offer. There were, however, a few who did not, and they subsequently regretted it when the period had elapsed for taking advantage of it. These ultimately petitioned the Bavarian Parliament to be allowed to surrender their manorial property for its value in Government securities. To meet their wishes a law was accordingly passed in 1872 enabling them to do so. By the law of the 4th of June, 1848, the peasant had to pay the State interest at 4 per cent. for eighteen times the value of his holding, and this was to remain a fixed charge upon the land. It was subsequently enacted that he was to pay a ninth on, and in addition to, the interest for which he was liable. The object of this additional ninth was gradually to cancel the whole debt, and this will be accomplished in about fifty-one years from this time. It must never be forgotten that the whole of this legislation dealt solely with feudal property. Those estates, or portions of estates, upon which there were farmers who had engaged to take from the owner a bit of what was called "free land," were untouched by it. Similar measures were adopted in Austria and throughout Germany, except Mecklenburg. The practical result has been to create a large number of peasant owners in fee simple, to simplify the title upon which land is held, and to introduce a system under which it may be bought and sold with the greatest facility in the open market.

The abolition of serfage in Russia is the next great event in the agrarian history of the century. This institution, which was first legalised by Boris Godunow in 1592, and was not introduced in Ukraine till the reign of Catherine II., had more than once produced revolutionary movements of a very menacing character. The last great outbreak was in 1773, when a Cossack named Pugatschew spread terror and desolation through the country of the Lower Volga, and the letters of General Bibikow show how serious that movement was.¹ Catherine, however, was unable to do anything in the direction of emancipation. She was distrusted as a foreigner, and could not rely on popular support. She felt that, under the circumstances, it would be dangerous to offend the nobility, and during her reign the condition of the peasantry became steadily worse. The Emperors Paul, Alexander, and Nicholas made some efforts in the direction of emancipation; but it was only when the Crimean war came to a close, and everybody felt that great and searching reforms would have to be made in every branch of the public service, that the emancipation of the serfs became a matter of prime necessity. There

(1) Barteniew : "Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert," iii. 232.

were three kinds of estates in Russia: those farmed by the proprietor himself, who took his dues in serf labour; those on which there were more serfs than the owner could employ, in which case they were allowed to go and work where they pleased, on condition of paying a fixed sum every year; finally, those which the proprietor did not farm at all. On these last all the serfs were treated like the supernumeraries on the second class of estates, and the owner arranged that the Commune should work his land. By the law of 1861 the serfs were declared personally free; the communal land was separated from the rest of the estate, and the price fixed which should be paid for it, including that portion upon which the village stood. The authority of the Commune replaced that of the proprietor, who had to be paid yearly dues in money or labour by the Commune for the land taken from him. But on its side, the Government agreed to assist the Commune to redeem these dues. The arrangement was that they should be capitalised at 6 per cent., that the State should advance four-fifths of the purchase-money at once, and that the peasants should pay the other one-fifth to the proprietors. Should any Commune refuse to enter into this arrangement, the proprietor might demand what was called obligatory redemption. This consisted in his accepting the four-fifths of the Government as payment in full, and the arrangement was then carried out, in spite of the peasants, who had to pay the Government six-tenths for forty-nine years over the sum advanced. Up to the beginning of 1875, 63 per cent. of the dues were cleared by obligatory redemption, and up to that time seven millions two hundred thousand male serfs had made redemption contracts.¹

The history of the decay of feudal society in most of the other countries may be dismissed in a few words. In Spain it was in reality destroyed by the Saracen conquest in the beginning of the eighth century. The Mahometan conquerors settled the Christian population on the land on favourable terms, and did what was possible to withdraw their sympathies from those who were laying the foundations of the future Spanish Monarchy in the mountains of the Asturias. The position of this remnant of the old lords of the peninsula was so precarious, especially during the first two centuries after the fall of the West Gothic Monarchy, that, by the force of circumstances, the old institutions gradually perished.

In Aragon and Catalonia things were different, owing to the Frankish conquest. But when Aragon and Castile were united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella, and when, after the conquest of Granada, they became the rulers of the whole of Spain, great agrarian reforms were carried through in Aragon. On the 1st of April, 1486, it was decreed that the feudal dues should be

(1) Wallace: *Russia*, vol. ii. 308.

reduced to a fixed sum, which might also be capitalised ; and at this date serfage was abolished throughout Spain. It would take us too long to trace Spanish agricultural history through the following centuries. I will merely say that, owing to some particular institutions, not in the least connected with feudalism, the peasant was so oppressed that, in the last century, the Benedictine monk, Feyoo, so good and sober an authority, does not hesitate to say that the lot of the Spanish agriculturist was worse than that of a criminal undergoing hard labour. In this century some of his peculiar grievances have been remedied. The secularisation and sale of the Church property by the minister Mendizabal, in 1835—36, and the further development of the same policy by Espartero in 1842, did not, however, benefit the peasant to the extent expected, and the chronic state of disturbance in the peninsula has not been favourable to agricultural business.

Up to the twelfth century the position of the cultivator of the soil in the greatest part of the Italian peninsula resembled that which he held in the Frankish Monarchy. At this period a great improvement in his condition took place, owing principally to the rise of the towns, and in the thirteenth century serfage began to be done away with in the northern part of the peninsula. The example was first set by the city of Bologna, which abolished serfage throughout its extensive territory in 1256, taking care, however, to respect all proprietary rights. Treviso followed in 1260, and soon after Florence. In a very short time it disappeared throughout Upper Italy. The agrarian history of Southern Italy was a very different one.

In the first half of the Middle Ages the peasantry of Naples and Sicily were by no means badly off, and, strange as it may seem, they owed this prosperity to the Mahometan conquest, which had very similar results there to what it had in Spain. During the three centuries that Sicily was ruled by the followers of the Prophet, it enjoyed a degree of prosperity which it has never since attained. The population of the island in the eleventh century was 2,773,404, or nearly three-quarters of a million more than it was in 1842.¹ With the Norman invasion things began to change, and a feudal system was imposed upon Southern Italy, which for many centuries pressed heavily on the population. The Hohenstaufen emperors, particularly Frederic II., did something to mitigate its evils, but after their time things began to go from bad to worse, until at last, in this century, the soldiers of the Revolution set the people free. In the Scandinavian countries, in Switzerland, in Holland, and Belgium, the agrarian development has all been in the same direction, and the practical result has been to make the cultivators

(1) Neigebauer : *Sicilien, dessen politische Entwicklung und jetzige Zustände*, pp. 14—27.

of the land the owners of it in most countries of Europe. In Russia at the present moment about a third of the land belongs to small communal proprietors; about a sixth is in the hands of large land-owners; and the remainder belongs to the State. Putting aside the property of the State, the land in the extreme north and south-east is owned exclusively by peasants. In the north-east and beyond the Volga they own from 70 to 90 per cent. of it, and in Central Russia from 50 to 70 per cent. In the south and west the land is about equally divided between the peasants and the large proprietors, but in the Baltic and Polish provinces the latter own much the largest portion. In an empire like the Russian agriculture will of course vary much in different provinces, but it is not hazardous to say that it has made little or no progress since 1861. Except in some parts of the southern Black Earth Zone, where some improvements have been made on a few large estates, and in a portion of Little Russia, where the cultivation of tobacco has made some progress, there is evidence to show that it has declined. In 1878 Count Walujew reported that the agricultural condition of Central Russia, and also of the north and east, was becoming daily worse, and the life of the agriculturist a harder struggle for existence, and during this year there has been a regular famine in some parts of the country. There are returns which show that in the province of Moscow between the years 1869 and 1877 the number of horses employed in farm labour had considerably decreased, and the number of cows owned by peasants had also diminished. But on looking into these figures more carefully it turns out that the number of peasants without a horse or a cow had increased, that the number with one horse and one cow had decreased, that those with two horses and two cows had rather increased, and finally those with a larger head of cattle had increased nowhere less than 30 and in some districts as much as 50 per cent.¹ In Middle Russia the peasant cannot live by agriculture alone. He must, therefore, wander about, picking up work where he can get it, or he must try and make a little money by some small trade. But this resource is now beginning to fail him. All this shows that there is in Russia an active development in the direction of the concentration of wealth and of the creation of a proletariat. The great institution of communal property in land which was to save the empire from the dangers which threaten society elsewhere is not answering its purpose in its present form, and the same problems which perplex statesmen in Western Europe are forcing themselves on the attention of those who govern the empire of the Czars.

The agrarian state of Italy is such as to cause the gravest anxiety to Italian statesmen. The corn trade, once so prosperous, has come to an end. The ships which enter the Italian harbours can get no

(1) A. Thun: *Landwirthschaft und Gewerbe in Mittel Russland seit Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft*, pp. 70-72.

return freight. The misery of the people is terrible, and in consequence the average length of human life is eight years less than in France, and sixteen less than in Norway. The *pellagra*, a horrible disease which causes insanity and death, and is produced by the habitual consumption of damaged corn, has increased of late years to an appalling extent. In the year 1830 there were 20,000 peasants suffering from it in Lombardy, and there were double that number in 1878. Jacini¹ gives an account of the life, food, and habitation of the peasants of Northern Italy, which could not be surpassed by the most sensational description of a cabin in the West of Ireland. Villari² tells a similar tale. Heavy taxation is also contributing to ruin the agriculturist. In the Commune of the Grotta S. Stefano, in the district of Viterbo, there were 19 little properties sold up on the 13th of October last, and I have been assured that in the course of last year there have been as many as 2,000 in the province of Rome alone. Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that emigration from Italy should have assumed considerable proportions. In the year 1867 there were 12,000 emigrants; 1868, 30,000; 1870, 40,000; 1873, 76,000; ³ 1876, 108,771; 1877 and during the first half of 1878, 160,008.⁴ In France there are also signs of agrarian trouble. In this country about a third of the soil is in the hands of small proprietors; the other two-thirds are cultivated on a large scale, and in some parts there are farms as extensive as those in the Lothians. It is on the larger properties that farming is beginning not to pay. The cultivation of the vine in those parts where the phylloxera has not appeared is remunerative, and the value of wood is steadily increasing. Up to the present time pasture lands let in Calvados for £5 and £6 an acre, and great profits were made by rearing cattle. This year, however, beasts have been brought from America in good condition and in great numbers. The price of butchers' meat has not fallen, but that of cattle is doing so very rapidly. The growth of corn in any great quantity will have to be abandoned. Foreign competition and the high price of labour render its cultivation unprofitable. The very small cottier who grows wheat for his own use or to sell to the little mills of his neighbourhood manages, perhaps, to make the two ends meet. The peasant proprietor or the farmer who is obliged to employ labour can no longer do so. The consequence is that many persons are embarrassed in those parts of France which have hitherto been the richest. In Beauce, Brie, and Picardy it is impossible to get farmers, and there are a number of holdings vacant which used to let for rents varying from £400 to £2,000 a year. Besides the fall of prices and the dearness

(1) *La Proprietà fondiaria.*

(2) *La Senola et la Question Sociale in Italia.*

(3) *Piccolo*, 26th July, 1877.

(4) *Gazzetta Ufficiale*, 23rd November, 1878.

of labour, the sons and daughters of farmers and peasant proprietors, whom their parents have sent to be educated in the towns, show in many cases a decided aversion for the routine and drudgery of country life. Some idea may be formed of the extent of this evil from the fact that in the Department de l'Orne there are 27,000 proprietors who do not cultivate themselves, and in l'Eure no less than 31,084. Where the holdings are small, there is no difficulty in finding tenants. In Berry a farm is seldom so large as to force the farmer to employ labour. As a rule, he manages to till it with the assistance of his family, and none of the landlords have had any of their farms thrown on their hands. On the other hand, in consequence of the smallness of the holdings and of the sums which the landlord has to expend on the construction and repair of numerous farm-buildings, he gets next to nothing out of his estate. The selling value, however, is continually increasing, because of the competition among the peasants for any bit of land that may be for sale. The condition of the small peasant proprietors is exceedingly good in those parts where they cultivate the ground themselves. They are becoming better off every year. They are well dressed and well fed. They eat meat and drink sound vin ordinaire. Their houses are solidly built and properly ventilated, and the mortgages on their properties have considerably diminished within the last thirty years.

The same account cannot be given of the small peasant proprietor in Germany. On the 7th of July the *Allgemeine Zeitung* published an article written by Herr v. Scheel, which gives a very fair idea of the real state of things. Scheel describes the financial condition of a peasant family consisting of the parents and five children, who own a little farm of nine acres, besides a small wood, which supplies them with fuel. They have one ox, two cows, one calf, and eleven hens. Of course the peasant has never corn or potatoes to spare, but the small size of his holding allows him to work as a farm labourer for about a hundred days in the year. Like every other peasant in the neighbourhood he had to borrow money to pay off his brothers and sisters, and the interest amounts to £7 4s. 3½d. He manages to sell every year—

	£	s.	d.
Milk	6	10	0
A calf	3	0	0
He earns at farm labour	11	0	0
Total	£20	10	0

His charges are—

	£	s.	d.
Interest on borrowed money	7	4	3½
House and land tax	0	11	6
Parish rate	0	10	3½
District rate	0	4	7½
Interest on land	0	17	8½
Total	£9	8	5

So that nearly 50 per cent. of a precarious income of £20 10s. goes in rates, taxes, and interest. This is the position of a small proprietor. Now let us look at a large one.

I know a peasant property of 84 acres of good land in one of the richest parts of South Germany. After providing for his household consumption, the owner sold this year corn—

	£	s.	d.
For which he got	153	0	0
Cattle	60	0	0
Cabbages	1	10	0
Total	£214	10	0

His expenditure was:—

	£	s.	d.
Rates and taxes	39	5	0
Labour	35	0	0
Wood	4	8	0
Miscellaneous connected with the farm	50	0	0
Interest to brothers and sisters .	37	10	0
Seeds	20	0	0
Total	£186	3	0

Leaving, therefore, a net profit of . £28 7 0

This is all he has to clothe his family and to fall upon in case of sickness or misfortune. Yet, in some ways, he is better off than many of his neighbours, for his brothers and sisters do not press for their interest, and he is not in the hands of usurers, who, like the "*gombeens*" of the West of Ireland, are the curse of the country.

Mr. Cope, in his report on the trade and agriculture of Bavaria, mentions an instance of a peasant who, in return for a loan of £25, bound himself to pay the money-lender £42 10s. at the end of three months. I know myself districts in Germany where a quarter, and sometimes even a half, of the peasant proprietors are on the verge of bankruptcy. It is not surprising, then, that in Bavaria alone no less than 698 peasant proprietors were evicted by their creditors in the first three months of this year. The figures are as follows:—In Upper Bavaria, 238; Lower Bavaria, 65; Upper Franconia, 66; Middle Franconia, 59; Lower Franconia, 93; Upper Palatinate, 66; Suabia, 106; the Palatinate proper, 5. The largest of these holdings was 115 acres, and the average size was 33 acres. Many other evictions have taken place since then. The Hypotheken und Wechsel Bank has evicted over 300 small proprietors, and at this moment it has 198 peasant properties for sale. The Boden-Credit-Bank and the Vereins-Bank have also had to seize a large number of these properties, the owners of which have either left the country or swell the ranks of the proletariat in the large towns. All this goes to show, and the agricultural statistics of Europe when they

are more closely analyzed will probably prove, that the mode in which land is held has less to say to agricultural prosperity than many suppose. This at least seems certain, that nowhere in Europe, from the slopes of the Ural to the shores of the Bay of Biscay and the Mediterranean, can corn be cultivated with profit, except in Hungary and in a portion of Southern Russia. Dairy farming in some parts holds its own, but profits on the rearing of stock are everywhere seriously threatened. The European agriculturist, as a general rule, is nowhere flourishing, except where he can cultivate the vine or grow hops, tobacco, or olives, or beet, if he happens to be near a sugar factory, or vegetables, if he is able to supply the market of some great neighbouring town. Strange as it may seem, an Irish farmer is often able to make his calling more profitable than those engaged in agriculture elsewhere. I know of one who holds 30 acres in a district scheduled in the Disturbance Bill of last session. About an acre and a quarter is occupied by his house, farm-buildings, fences, road, &c. He had this year $6\frac{1}{4}$ acres under potatoes :—

	£	s.	d.
$6\frac{1}{4}$ acres under potatoes	187	10	0
Turnips and cabbage	23	0	0
11 acres of corn, by which he made	102	0	0
5 tons of hay, average price £3 per ton	15	0	0
4 calves, at £3 10s. each	14	0	0
12 firkins of butter, which this year made	48	0	0
7 young pigs, worth £1 10s. each	10	10	0
Total	£400	0	0

His outgoings were :—

	£	s.	d.
Rent	60	0	0
Taxes	7	14	$10\frac{1}{2}$
Keep of 2 horses	30	0	0
Keep of 4 cows	20	0	0
Interest on price of stock	5	0	0
Cost of seed, sowing and saving potatoes, £6 an acre	37	10	0
Cost of seed, sowing and saving barley, £2 10s. an acre	27	10	0
Cost of sowing and saving turnips, £1 15s. an acre	1	15	0
Cost of clover and grass seed, and putting into rick	3	0	0
Planting cabbage	0	10	0
Wages of servant man	12	0	0
Cost of the keep of same, 6d. a day	9	2	6
Total	£214	2	$4\frac{1}{2}$

showing a clear profit of £185 17s. $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. for a man whose valuation is £29 10s., and whose rent is £60 a year.¹ Now, honestly, who is

(1) I have allowed nothing for the sale of eggs, but he has often made by them as much as £15 or £20 in the year. I know that last year a farmer on a neighbouring

better off, the Irish farmer just cited, who pays a rent double his valuation, or the South German peasant proprietor, who owns nearly three times the amount of land, and considers himself lucky if he puts £28 in his pocket at the end of the year? And everybody acquainted with the circumstances of Irish farming knows very well that this is an ordinary instance, where the land is good and the holding not too large. A farm of from twenty-five to forty acres is what best pays the Irish agriculturist. Larger farms do not suit the nature of the soil or climate, are too expensive to manage, and do not afford means for men of small capital to take to agricultural life. On the other hand, if the holding is very small, the peasant has often considerable difficulty in paying his way. It is, however, a grave error to look at the Irish land question solely from the point of view of agriculture. It is far more a political than an agrarian problem. This is the real reason why it is so difficult to solve.

It has been proposed that a Royal Commission should be issued, with powers to buy the estates of those who are willing to sell at a fixed number of years' purchase, with a view of establishing a peasant proprietary, and that all restrictions on the sale of land should be removed and a cheap and expeditious mode of land transfer introduced. I have no doubt that if this proposal were adopted the results would be beneficial. Many Irish landlords have estates elsewhere, and would not be unwilling to sell their Irish property. Large tracts of country would at once pass into the hands of peasant owners, who are, as I think I have shown, often much better off than people think, and who would make every effort to fulfil their obligations. It is surely a most significant fact that, although some five or six thousand peasant proprietors have been created under the Disestablishment Act, the Church Commissioners have never had to foreclose a mortgage. If the Irish landlords were given the option of selling or retaining their properties, those who chose the latter alternative, which the peculiar affections which attach themselves to ancestral property might induce many to select, would have no reason to complain of any new regulations Parliament might impose. On this condition it would be quite fair, in the interests of public policy, to give the cultivating peasantry some proprietary right in the holdings which they till. Any attempt, however, to interfere with the proprietary rights either of individuals or corporations, unless full compensation be given, will most likely not have a mere temporary success as a palliative measure, and is certain in the end to make confusion worse confounded. It is too likely to be a mere repetition of the

estate made no less than £70 by eggs. The seven pigs are estimated at what they are worth now, but by fattening them on the refuse potatoes, &c., they will be worth £5 a head at six months old, and by the time they are sold, there will be seven or possibly nine more to take their place. A "lucky" sow is considered a clear profit of £50 a year.

old method of sacrificing one Irish interest to another. This is the policy which England has pursued in Ireland for centuries, and the result cannot be said to be brilliant. What is wanted in Ireland is free play for the forces of economic law. And this can only be obtained by a scheme which, without doing injustice to any one, would make the farmers of Ireland in large numbers owners of their holdings, and which would give to those who had to continue tenants, fixity of tenure at a fixed rent.

I am quite aware that all this would not result in the creation of a peasant Arcadia. It would not put a stop to emigration, and to those distressing scenes so often witnessed at Irish railway stations. The number of these might, however, be considerably diminished by a scheme of emigration which would tend to hinder the break-up of families. Evictions would not cease, but they would wear another aspect in the eyes of the public. The unthrifty or careless farmer would have less hold on the land than he has at present, and when he lost it in consequence of not fulfilling his obligations he would not be, as now, an object of public sympathy. At present, if a large landed proprietor has nine or ten ejectments at Quarter Sessions, the single fact that one man, supposed to be rich, is pressing nine or ten other men, supposed to be poor, is what arrests attention. No matter what the rights or wrongs of the cases may be, the landlord is considered an oppressor. He is denounced as a rack-renter, although he may be able to prove that his land may be let far below what well-to-do and industrious tenants could easily pay for it. He is held up to odium as a hard, exacting man, although his list of arrears may show that he has been considerate in the extreme, and his character will suffer in the exact proportion in which he or his ancestors have been soft-hearted and allowed a needy class of tenants to increase upon the estate. The result is that an unhealthy public opinion is created and fostered. All this would change surely and rapidly if agrarian legislation such as I have indicated were adopted. If a peasant proprietor should come to grief, no landlord could be accused of having caused his misfortune; and the most prejudiced adversary of the Irish aristocracy would have to admit that the tenant-farmers of the country were the complete masters of their own destinies if they had fixity of tenure at a fixed rent, and of course, as a natural consequence, the right of free sale.

ROWLAND BLENNERHASSETT.

TREATIES OF COMMERCE A SURRENDER OF PRINCIPLE.

THE discussions between two such important nations as France and Great Britain—conducted as these discussions are in two different languages—cannot fail to arrest the attention of a wider circle than the peoples more immediately concerned, and a more intelligent interest in economic questions may thereby be awakened. If a general conversion to free trade doctrines cannot be expected, one may at least hope that some prejudices in favour of protection may thus be dispelled or prevented from taking too deep root, and consumers learn their power to exercise a very decisive influence in the compilation of tariffs. That those who have to pay the Customs duties should have no voice, or certainly not a preponderating one, in their settlement, seems an anomaly; but hitherto this large class has been only called in to approve, and not permitted to object. Every Government has thought it sufficiently cared for the national welfare, if it consulted the manufacturing interests only, and then effected the most practicable or most easily obtainable compromise between the sometimes purposely exaggerated pretensions of rival industries.

Until very recently the desirability of treaties of commerce remained unquestioned, but public opinion has at length found an utterance. Several important Chambers of Commerce have already declared their preference for no treaty at all, rather than one that fails to improve the present position in a free trade direction, and have insisted on the desirability, in any case, of making treaties terminable with twelve months' notice. As far as Great Britain is concerned, it seems especially hazardous to disregard the constant liability to changes in our commercial relations with the outer world, and to accept conditions under any treaty that shall bind our trade to follow a predetermined course for a given number of years.

The present clamour by other countries for treaty engagements on the ground that their absence would paralyse business through uncertainty, and ruin many small industries, has caused it to dawn upon this country that, with freedom of trade and freedom from any treaty, these uncertainties do not arise, and that any treaty must necessarily be more to the advantage of the foreigner than to ours, and that we really require no treaty at all. If the people of this country are permitted, without let or hindrance, to purchase their various wants where they think proper—and this will be in the cheapest market at the time of requirement, and not necessarily always in the same market—it may surely be left to sellers to see

how they obtain payment. In other words, according to the old phrase, let our care be expended on imports, and the exports can take care of themselves.

Whatever may be the doubts and uncertainties of statesmen on this point, this we do know, viz. that all countries, and protectionist countries in no slight degree, look to Great Britain, or the markets of the world which British buyers command, as the great outlet for their goods. They triumph exceedingly when they obtain an entrance, and accept sacrifices to insure it or push a trade, though it may be frequently only by way of advertisement, but it is inconceivable that they should ever seek to supply us permanently without requiring payment of some kind. An obstruction to this golden rule of commerce is now interposed by Customs arrangements, which limit payments to specie or those goods which are not subject to almost prohibitive duties, but one can imagine the force of circumstances to be powerful enough to break down this barrier. In endeavouring, by commercial treaties, to force our goods upon foreigners in payment of our purchases, we have surrendered the very principles it was our duty as a free trading nation to uphold, and we should have acted more wisely in leaving foreign sellers, if they will not take our manufactures in payment, to lose our custom altogether, or find their remedy as creditors in the usual way. We have argued and endeavoured to show the excellences of free trade, and the more we have done so the greater have been the suspicion of our disinterestedness and the disinclination to adopt what has been supposed to be the selfish policy of perfidious Albion. Foreign nations have been taught to regard it as the truest patriotism to thwart our endeavours to facilitate intercourse, and to open wider and wider still our markets to a trade of mutual advantage. To cripple us where they could by a hostile tariff, has been accepted accordingly as a sacred duty. Under the guise of protection to Home industry and rendering it independent of British goods, the aim kept steadily in view has been the weakening of our manufacturing supremacy, with the result that foreign and British industries have been alike injured, and those obstacles to international commercial relations created which periodically find vent in a general lament of over-production.

Not contented with artificially creating and fostering native manufacturing industries, protection has also called to its aid the nostrums of bounties, drawbacks, and *acquits-à-caution* to stimulate an export trade in rivalry (outside the home trade) with Great Britain; and this with the absurd idea of national enrichment through supplying a foreign country at a considerable reduction on the prices obtained from the tax-paying community at home. These stimulants to the export trade are based upon the notion

that national prosperity is promoted in some mysterious way by sales rather than acquisitions by purchase. To sell and not to buy is the ideal condition of trade sought by every protectionist country, and because the thrift and industry of the French and the immense home market of the United States permit a show of prosperity, and have counteracted or deferred the evil effects of their trade policy, it is contended by many economists that a one-sided trade is more conducive to the well-being of a nation than free and unrestricted barter with the outside world.

One has but to penetrate the surface of such prosperity as is tabled in official returns, to learn the grievances of the masses under such a policy. Though every man's hand may be said to be against Great Britain, as exemplified in hostile tariffs, our position as individual traders is universally considered a very enviable one. We are congratulated on being freed from the thousand and one nuisances connected with the levy and payment of Customs duties. They envy us our ability with a small capital to enter upon and develop trade in any direction in which an opening may present itself, and the trader's career with us is credited with prospects of wealth, and usefulness, and comfort, that have to be sought elsewhere in special and protected grooves, at the Bourse, or in Government employ.

That under a protectionist policy large industries have been created is no doubt unquestionable. At International Exhibitions their stalls and separate pavilions overpower the exhibits of British manufacture and powerfully impress the spectator. But the test of competitive power does not lie in this, and the results promised and expected from the imposition of duties for the creation of native industries, have generally proved sadly inadequate. When Government Commissions abroad have investigated the position of trades preparatory to the renewal of treaties, manufacturers have solemnly assured them that in spite of their supposed stability they are as yet quite unable to withstand the competition of English firms, and their respective industries would be grievously affected by reduction of duties, whilst an abandonment would wholly ruin them. Yet a little while, yet another ten years, and we shall be able to throw away our crutches, they all cry in chorus. So one decade follows another; the fortunate few add to their wealth, and the patient many struggle on in silence and in hope, doomed to continue hewers of wood and drawers of water until the end, leaving the heritage of expectancy to yet another generation.

The pleas adduced in defence of continued protection to the never-ending infancy and helplessness of non-British manufacturing industries, are, the greater natural advantages of Great Britain, its geographical position, the contiguity of its coal and iron, its climate

which permits as a rule uninterrupted labour, its command of trained artisans and capital, and long-established connections. This is so true, and so little likely to be altered, as to appear to lead direct to the conclusion, that since we do not hinder other countries from freely obtaining what they want more cheaply than they can otherwise do, it is folly and waste of time and money to deprive themselves of the benefit equally at their command as at our own. Moreover, as by hostile tariffs our trade is unduly depressed, higher and higher duties must be put on effectually to exclude us from the power of supply which so alarms them. Every economy of manufacture or cost of transport which we can accomplish, and which the war of hostile tariffs imposes as a necessary weapon of defence, is an added grievance to a protectionist country, and provides fresh argument for the continuance of a system which seems designed to prevent cheapness and ready acquisition of what the bulk of a population require.

This further consideration presses upon foreign governments, namely, that, having artificially created hives of industry, they dare not now risk a disturbance which might open the floodgates of latent Socialist, Nihilist, or other revolutionary sentiment. The root of these subversive feelings is not so much political as material discontent, and a protectionist trade policy which favours the few and imposes sacrifices on the many, is the soil in which they best flourish.

We may believe it far from improbable that leading statesmen abroad are as fully convinced of the soundness of the free trade theory as our own, and were they free to act on their own judgment and opinions, would willingly adopt and carry it out. It is circumstances and political considerations which make it, with every year, a matter of greater difficulty, and to substitute direct taxation for the present system of collecting revenue may seem to them on many grounds perilous or impossible in the present temper of their peoples. It must be confessed, too, that long years of habit have so accustomed the masses to octroi and Customs interference in their daily life, that to be relieved from search and control, and told that the large sums exacted from them in small amounts on almost everything they buy would be henceforth commuted for a few francs or marks, payable quarterly or half-yearly to the tax-gatherer, would seem to many a crushing burden. The direct taxation would be felt—the indirect is supposed to pass unnoticed, or not to affect those who cannot buy.

We have nothing to fear from legitimate competition in any quarter of the globe. If of late years our competitive power has appeared weakened, it has been more in appearance than reality, although our direct trade with many countries has no doubt been hampered and injured through the illegitimate national subsidies of

one kind or another granted to foreign manufacturers with the intention of supplanting British goods.

That Great Britain has not succumbed to, or been sensibly affected as a manufacturing nation by, the heavy blows inflicted and meant to be inflicted by hostile tariffs on all sides, is owing to our abandonment of the vicious systems of trade policy adopted by other countries, and once fondly clung to by ourselves. We owe it to free trade, or such approach to real free trade as we possess, that "cheap living" has been secured to us, and thereby an effective barrier raised against the wave of depression that of late years has passed over our trade. To further and maintain the means of "cheap living" is of greater national importance than any struggle to introduce our manufactured goods into protectionist countries under commercial treaties. Whilst deprecating protection to foreign manufacturing interests, we have made ourselves the champions and partisans of British manufactures, and hence many of those conflicts of interests and heart-burnings which hinder the reception of true theories of trade.

But the whole nation is the ally of foreign agriculturists, since we are admittedly dependent on foreign countries for our food supplies. We would willingly help our farmers at home, but recognise the fact that under our conditions we can as little compete with lands more favoured in soil or climate in the production of corn, as we can hope to grow oranges in competition with Spain.

Thus then our care for the introduction of our manufactured goods into foreign countries is lessened, and our interest chiefly centred in the development of foreign agricultural resources and their power of producing and sending us cheap food of every description. We deplore the sacrifices that have been imposed upon and so long endured by foreign agriculturists for the benefit of their limited manufacturing interest. As consumers of their produce we have ultimately to pay for this protection in the increased price demanded of us as purchasers; or to secure us as buyers they have to work for the minimum of profit. We must naturally desire with them that they should be relieved of all that hinders their advancement or profit, that they should be cheaply supplied with machinery and farming implements, and all the requirements for cheapening tillage and delivery to our markets. It is not because we prefer American-grown corn to Baltic, Austrian, French, or Russian produce, that the last-named countries have lost their hold on our markets, but because they have not been careful to meet the competition of Transatlantic sources of supply by relieving their agricultural interests of all burdens that cause them to produce too dearly, or overweight them with cost of transport. The bugbear of an inundation of English goods and machinery and implements has not permitted continental agricul-

tourists to avail themselves of the help that free trade would have enabled us to offer, and they have now not infrequently themselves to look to Transatlantic sources for supplementary food supply. In addition to the vexatious action of hostile tariffs, we have had our full share of expensive wars, domestic troubles, and trade discontent in various forms. It cannot be said that as a nation we have gone back or fallen out of the race, whatever may be thought of some of our industries. We seem, on the contrary, to have weathered the storm of long-continued bad trade in a very satisfactory manner, to have steadily progressed and strengthened the latent power of our resources, and to be ready to sustain the competition of any nation for new business, when the long-desired improvement in trade appears.

From our own Government we ask for nothing but to be let alone—to be allowed to use unhindered and with hands untied what the French minister speaks of as “creative genius” in the French people, but what we may more modestly speak of as our talents and industry. Especially shall we do well to remain unfettered as regards treaty engagements for ten years, a period over which no man, in these days of rapid change, can confidently foretell the working of industrial and commercial conditions.

And since from foreign governments we have, as a trading community, nothing to hope for as regards facilities of intercourse; since we are well assured that every effort will continue to be made to exclude our manufactures, and concessions be made only in favour of our raw material, coal, pig iron, &c., which to many districts abroad is a real need; and since, where tariff concessions are made, it will be quite practicable by internal regulations as regards detention and mode of levying the Customs dues, inland railway rates, and regulations, &c., to raise up obstacles to a trade unwillingly forced upon protectionist countries by treaty; why should we not withdraw from all government interference and let matters take their own course? We have not adopted a free trade policy without much hesitation, and less from conviction than necessity. If in the school of adversity we have learnt to value free trade, let us hope that the teachings of experience and our practical example may quicken the perceptions of foreign peoples more rapidly than advice or arguments, which hitherto have proved a failure.

The French people cannot shut their eyes to the fact that whereas before the adoption of a mildly liberal trade policy in 1860 (to call it a “free trade” policy is misleading), their exports to Great Britain were but nine millions, they are now forty millions sterling per annum, and a very large proportion of their whole trade. If the French people cannot appreciate the value of this market, it would seem as if Spain and Italy could do so, for a public opinion in favour of free trade seems actually in process of formation there.

Of these countries and their so-called concessions and favoured nation clauses, we should be strong enough in our free trade faith to say, as in the case of France, that they may do as they please. The mere renewal of an admittedly advantageous treaty produces, as we see in the Anglo-French negotiations, squabbles upon the respective merits of specific and *ad valorem* duties, and angry feelings that might easily produce a coolness in political relations, and these should serve as a warning to us not to expose ourselves to a repetition, which can best be insured by refraining from entering into any treaty at all, and thus rendering discussion needless.

What useful purpose can these treaties serve? We will buy or we will sell, and it should not be assumed that those from whom we buy or to whom we sell will allow us to trade with them unless they find their advantage in the process. To tie us as a free-trading nation to nations that cannot or will not act upon the same principle is an injustice, an unnatural union, and necessarily a gratuitous injury to sound and wholesome trade. An act like the refusal to enter into any treaty at all, especially in the case of a near neighbour, a good friend, an important commercial nation, and a great power like France, would show in an unmistakable way that we were really prepared to stand up for what we believe to be right and beneficial. We could not then be accused of being lip free-traders only, and as ready to impose the despotism of protection through a commercial treaty as the worst of those protectionist countries we condemn, and men would be encouraged to study a policy which the half-heartedness of its apostles now causes many to look upon with misgiving.

That losses and inconvenience might arise to special industries and classes is possible, but it is the special merit of a free trade policy that it places foremost in its considerations the national weal; and however respectable and important the units of manufacturing interests to be considered, yet the nation includes, and is above and beyond them all. The nation will not cease for want of a treaty to buy such French goods as we require and can obtain on better conditions than they are procurable at the moment elsewhere, and most assuredly the nation will pay for them somehow, directly or indirectly, in our goods. If it were possible to make this impossible for us by a new French tariff which excluded most rigorously all our goods, our orders would simply go to some more accommodating market, and it may safely be predicted that the French nation will not allow their rulers to enter upon so suicidal a course without an interference which will further aid the cause of international intercourse and freedom of trade.

JAMES BIRD.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE most remarkable spectacle witnessed in July was one which has excited least remark. As a mere matter of physical endurance, the achievement of the Prime Minister in carrying single-handed the Irish Land Bill through Committee of the House of Commons is almost without a parallel in the history of Parliaments. Through the whole of the sultriest July in the memory of the present generation—the thermometer once touched 97° in the shade and 153° in the sun—without the intermission of a single sitting, Mr. Gladstone conducted the discussion of the vast and complicated details of his great measure in the face of the hostile and sometimes obstructive criticism of experts of opposing schools, displaying a tenacity of purpose as extraordinary as his uniform patience and ready appreciation of the merits of the innumerable proposals pressed upon him from every side. The whole of the time of the House was devoted to the Land Bill, and the whole charge of the Bill devolved upon its author. Mr. Gladstone's curious flexibility of intellect, his wonderful grasp of the minutest details of a great work of constructive statesmanship, his keen perception of the bearings of every suggested alteration were never more conspicuously illustrated. The uninterrupted tension, the wearing strain never for a moment relaxed, might have broken down the strongest. But Mr. Gladstone, with more than the weight of threescore years and ten upon his shoulders, bore the strain not only without staggering, but with so much ease that men forgot the greatness of the task in the facility of its execution. Even miracles cease to seem miraculous if often repeated, and Mr. Gladstone's astonishing *tour de force*, which at the beginning was regarded with much foreboding, became in the end as much a matter of course as the rising of the sun. Mr. Gladstone was always at his post, always ready to explain obscurities, to answer objections, and to defend the propositions of his Government against the assaults of land leaguers on the one hand and landlords on the other, always on the alert, following every turn of the debate with never-flagging interest and inexhaustible patience.

The patience was perhaps the most marvellous of all. Mr. Gladstone has long been recognised as the greatest driving force in English politics, but in former years he chafed visibly at obstacles and fretted at the factions which impeded his advance in a fashion which led his enemies to accuse him of an imperious temper, and a passionate impatience. During the present session, although never has there been a greater pressure of pounds on the square inch,

there has never been so little display of irritation at obstinate and unreasoning opposition. Mr. Gladstone must often have felt as the driver of the Scotch express, already behind time, who sees the track blocked by the carelessness which has shunted a cattle train across the line. Yet no trace of temper has shown itself in his demeanour. As a mere physical feat, the achievement is one of the most memorable of our time, but as an exhibition of the higher qualities of statesmanship, in combination with intellectual ability and absolute moral control, it forms an episode in English history of which men of every party may well be proud.

The spectacle is significant in more ways than one. It affords an illustration of the extent to which in our constitutional system the one-man power can make itself felt, and the recognition of the ability of the supremely able man which is possible in parliamentary institutions. All the six hundred members of the House of Commons stand nominally on an equal footing with the member for Midlothian. But as a matter of fact, no autocrat is more absolute within a certain range than the First Lord of the Treasury. The Irish Land Bill is the work of Mr. Gladstone, and almost of Mr. Gladstone alone. His was the original conception, his the elaboration of its minutest details, and on him alone naturally rested the responsibility, which no one else could fulfil, of defending its clauses in Committee. The constitutional autocracy possible under the parliamentary system is infinitely more arduous for its possessor than the absolute autocracy of an uncontrolled Emperor. The constitutional autocrat is liable to be called upon to justify his title to rule at any moment by any member of the governing House. His sovereignty is subject to a perpetual check in the shape of an indirect plebiscite of the second degree, and every exercise of his authority may be debated and must be defended against the criticism of six hundred fellow-members. Democracy imposes ample guards for the security of its liberties, but it is not impossible that these securities may be so excessive as to exhaust the energies of the governor in vindicating his right to govern. Mr. Gladstone, it is true, has energy enough to spare after vindicating his title to govern, but where is another statesman who has the energy, physical as well as intellectual, of Mr. Gladstone?

The Land Bill in its progress through Committee has been considerably modified. All attempt to define the principles on which fair rents should be settled by the Land Court has been abandoned. The Commissioners will be trammelled by no statutory limitation in deciding the fairness of the rent of the future tenant. The effect of this alteration will depend upon the view taken by the Commissioners of what constitutes a fair rent, but it has been generally regarded as a concession to the landlords. It has been

balanced by concessions to the tenants on the questions of leases and of arrears, while the scope of the Bill has been extended by the introduction of clauses intended to promote the welfare of the labourers. Tenants who can prove that they were practically compelled to accept leases under threat of the forfeiture of their interest on their holdings are to be entitled to appeal to the Land Court to cancel their lease, after which they can apply in ordinary course for the fixing of a fair rent. In the case of arrears, provision is made for the payment of the greater portion of the arrears of rent due for the last three years by means of a loan, to be repaid in instalments added to the rent for the next fifteen years. The clauses providing for the labourers restore the clause relating to allotments struck out of the Bill of 1870 by the House of Lords, give the labourer right to appeal to the court to fix his rent, and provide advances for the erection of dwelling-houses. The rest of the Bill remains practically unaltered. The Irish members made a combined attempt to secure an advance of four-fifths of the purchase-money to peasants intending to purchase their holdings instead of three-fourths, but it was defeated by the almost unanimous vote of the English and Scotch members. A minority of Irish members made a sustained and obstructive attack upon the emigration clause, but beyond limiting the advance offered to £200,000, they effected no material change in the provisions of that section of the Bill.

On the whole the Liberals in the House have given a steady support to the Ministerial proposals. The Opposition has seldom made even a respectable show of fight at the crucial divisions. The second reading was carried by a majority of two to one, and the vital clause containing the principle of fair rent by a majority of 132. Only once was there a serious defection, when the Ministry narrowly escaped defeat upon Mr. Heneage's amendment exempting estates managed on English principles from the operation of the Bill. The abstention of some Whigs, and the opposition of others, who did not scruple to go into the division lobby with the Conservatives, would have secured the acceptance of the amendment but for the Home Rule vote, which was cast solid for the Government. The mischief of this defection has been aggravated by an injudicious speech of the Postmaster-General, who almost invited the House of Lords to adopt Mr. Heneage's amendment by the strange doctrine which he laid down as to the propriety of the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill last Session. Without entering into a dispute as to the functions of the House of Lords, Mr. Fawcett seems to have forgotten that the acceptance of his doctrine would render indispensable the enforcement of a much stricter discipline in the ranks of the Ministerial majority in the House of Commons than has hitherto been deemed necessary. Constituencies which might tolerate an

occasional vote by their representatives against a Ministerial measure, or against one of its vital clauses, if the matter ended there, will be much less disposed to forgive a display of independence which is regarded as a legitimate excuse to the other Chamber for the rejection or mutilation of the Bill. The worst "tyranny of the caucus" will be condoned, rather than that the ministerial dissidents should become masters of the situation by co-operation with the House of Lords.

The Parliamentary breakdown has in one sense been the most signal of any on record. Parliament met in January, and will probably not be prorogued till September, but a Session prolonged beyond precedents is likely to be characterized by barrenness without parallel. The Parliamentary collapse is almost painfully complete. Measures of pressing urgency affecting the vital interests of the United Kingdom are blocked. Nothing can be done. The Parliamentary machine has broken down, and the paralysis of the legislature is at last being recognised as a grave public peril. The time of the House of Commons is eaten into at both ends. Questions, three-fourths of which could be answered in print on the notice papers, consume two hours at the beginning of the sitting; the half-past twelve o'clock rule, which forbids the taking of any opposed business after that hour, arms each member of the House at the other end of the sitting with the *liberum veto* of the Polish diet. If Parliamentary Government has to continue a possibility in this country, the reform of Parliamentary procedure must be taken in hand without any longer delay. Even a Government by ukase may come to be preferred to the Government of a legislature which cannot legislate. "The waste of public time," which Mr. Disraeli many years ago declared to be "as valuable as public treasure," cannot be allowed to go on unchecked. The old unwritten restraints upon the apparently unlimited license of discussion have lost their efficiency. They will have to be replaced by others adapted to the new conditions of an altered time. When the subject is seriously approached, the question of the utility of the Upper Chamber can hardly escape examination. Whatever its uses may be, it unquestionably operates as a constant check on legislation. A true friend, says the old saw, doubles your joys and halves your sorrows, but this arithmetical operation is reversed in the case of the House of Lords. The Peers reduce by half the useful legislation of the Session, and double the time and trouble required to get Bills passed into law. The constitutional rate of progress through the House of Commons is certainly slow enough to satisfy a tortoise, but most great measures have to go through all these stages twice over before they can make their way through the Upper Chamber. In some cases Bills have had to be passed toilsomely five,

six, and even seven times through the House of Commons, and not until the seven-fold sacrifice of a Session has been complete has the Hereditary Chamber consented to accept a Bill demanded by the representatives of the people. Even when the Peers do not reject a Bill outright, they usually contrive to mutilate it in such a fashion as to compel the House of Commons to devote the most precious days of the expiring Session in undoing the mischief wrought in another place. The Parliamentary deadlock would be much less formidable, and the security for useful legislation much increased, if the royal assent were given to measures as soon as they were read a third time by the House of Commons.

One consequence of the Parliamentary breakdown this year has been the withdrawal, among a mass of other Bills, of the measure enabling members to make an affirmation instead of swearing on taking their seats. This Bill, introduced in order to relieve the House of the difficulty in which it was placed by the decision of the majority which on this question is directed by Lord Randolph Churchill and Sir H. D. Wolff, was rendered urgent by the determination of the junior member for Northampton to take his seat. Its withdrawal, although a necessity under the circumstances, led him to renew his application to be admitted to the House. By an unconstitutional resolution passed in face of the opposition of the responsible ministers of the Crown, he is forbidden to take the oath, and by another resolution, the inevitable corollary of the first, he is forbidden access to the precincts of the House. These resolutions Mr. Bradlaugh has now declared his determination to defy, if needs be, by force, and he has fixed the 3rd of August for his attempt to take his seat. The House, which has so recklessly embarked on a conflict with the duly-elected representative of the constituency of Northampton, cannot allow its resolutions to be set at naught, and will of necessity plunge still further on the unconstitutional path on which it was launched by personal prejudices, veiled behind religious bigotry. From a party point of view the Conservatives are wise in their generation, and their success exciting against every Liberal member the popular odium attaching to the militant high priest of aggressive atheism and Malthusian morality, must be gall and wormwood to those weak-kneed members to whose desertion of these principles when the Bradlaugh question first came before the House all the subsequent trouble is due.

Another consequence of the necessary absorption of the whole time of the House of Commons by the Land Bill has been the postponement until the end of the month of Sir M. Hicks-Beach's motion on the affairs of the Transvaal. The Opposition has made capital out of a delay by which after all it was the chief gainer. Lord Carnarvon has repeatedly assailed the policy of the Government in

the House of Lords. Lord Salisbury has attacked it in Willis's Rooms, when introducing a Dutch slaveowner and an English soldier of fortune to the central Conservative caucus as representatives of the loyalists of the Transvaal. No adequate reply has been made, excepting Mr. Chamberlain's speech at Birmingham, to the powerful impeachment brought against the Government by Lord Cairns. But the barren nature of the Conservative recriminations serves as the best defence of the Ministerial policy. The Transvaal was annexed confessedly in the belief that the majority of the Boers wished for annexation. Nothing can be more explicit than the declarations of the late Government that nothing would have induced them to sanction that annexation against the wishes of the Boers. When it was proved beyond any doubt that the annexation had been carried out against the wishes of the inhabitants, and that the Boers were so hostile to our sovereignty as to necessitate the occupation of their territory by a large military force, which could only be maintained at the cost of the Imperial exchequer, it was impossible to persist in holding the country without violating the principles upon which it was annexed, and incurring an expenditure which the British taxpayer would not tolerate. The manner of executing the abandonment and the policy which is to be adopted in the future may be open to criticism, but the retrocession of the Transvaal can only be assailed by those who are willing to incur the expense and face the difficulties of holding down the Boers by an adequate garrison. The Conservatives shirk this critical point and continue to declaim against the policy of the Government, without venturing to say that they would face the alternative which the retention of the Transvaal would involve. Not even Lord Carnarvon can both have his cake and eat it too, but that homely truth does not seem to be appreciated by the leaders of the Opposition.

The English-speaking world experienced a severe shock at the beginning of July by the attempted assassination of President Garfield. Guiteau, a disappointed politician of doubtful sanity belonging to the Conkling section of the Republican party, indignant at the rejection of his claims to be appointed Consul at Marseilles, and excited by the abuse heaped unsparingly upon the head of the President by the newspapers of the Conkling faction, determined that his death was a political necessity. Arming himself with a pistol, he shot the President twice in the loins as he was standing in a railway station. The wounds, although very serious, did not prove fatal. Guiteau was arrested, and confessed his crime. The incident excited universal horror on both sides of the Atlantic, and the sentiment of horror at the crime was not dulled, as in other cases, by any feeling of sympathy with the assassin. The attempt illustrates the

danger of carrying party rancour to extremes—a danger of which it is quite possible that we may have other illustrations nearer home. When political partisans persuade themselves that either a President or a Premier is the embodiment of evil, there is always a danger that some desperado fanatic or brooding enthusiast may attempt to mete out justice by the pistol or the dagger. The death of President Garfield would have placed Vice-President Arthur in the presidential chair, and Mr. Arthur being a Conklingite, Guiteau's crime, if successful, would have effected as great a displacement of political forces as a change which placed Lord Hartington in the position of Mr. Gladstone. Guiteau himself might not have profited by it, but Guiteau's friends and associates could hardly have failed to secure some of the spoils of office which at present have fallen chiefly to the friends of Mr. Blaine. The commonplaceness of Guiteau's attempt deprives it of much of the horror inspired by the more elaborate outrages in Russia. Rulers have always been exposed to such attacks as that to which President Garfield so nearly fell a victim, and it has long been accepted as a truism that no one's life is safe if another is determined to sacrifice his own in taking it. Government, nevertheless, has always gone on. Nor has the personal insecurity of the governor ever been a serious difficulty in the way of administering the affairs of States. Considering the antipathy which even the most popular rulers must excite at times in the breasts of some of their subjects, the marvel is not that attempts to assassinate are so frequent, but that they so seldom succeed.

The review of 58,000 volunteers by the Queen at Windsor contributed much to increase the complacency with which Englishmen reflect upon their military position. Never since the Edwards mustered their forces against the Scots has so large a force been reviewed by an English sovereign—a fact which in these days, when at least three continental States can put a million fighting men into the field, is a suggestive commentary upon the silly boasting concerning our military strength which fortunately is much less common now than it was three years ago. The review passed off without a hitch. The men were collected in twenty-four hours from all parts of England, and they went through their evolutions with a regularity and a discipline which afforded a marked contrast to the early traditions of the force. In case of any real danger, four times the number of those who marched past the Queen in the park at Windsor could be put into the field to oppose an expected invasion. Private initiative and individual enterprise have secured for Great Britain a stronger reserve in twenty years than the combined efforts of the Horse Guards and the War Office have been able to produce since the battle of Waterloo.

Oddly enough the mustering of the volunteers in Windsor Park coincided with a revival of the old uneasy feelings concerning France in which the volunteer movement took its rise. The possible lapse of the commercial treaty between this country and our neighbours across the Channel, the sudden revival of French chauvinism in the Mediterranean, and the discussion of the possibility of a Franco-German alliance for mutual plunder, created a feeling of unrest and anxiety to which Englishmen have been strangers since Sedan. It is not till the last few weeks that England has begun to appreciate how much she owed to the German conquest of France. For ten years no thought of danger from the only Power which could invade our shores has ever crossed the mind of the most inveterate panic-monger. To get up a scare the alarmist has had to travel to the valley of the Danube, or take up his parable about the deserts of Central Asia. Since 1871 it has been impossible to frighten even the most timorous by threats of a French invasion. That period of tranquillity, however, is now at an end. France has resumed her place as a disturbing element of European peace. She has reorganised her army and equipped her fortresses. She is strengthening her navy and giving the rein to her Forward School from Tahiti to Newfoundland. In Tunis she has executed a raid as cynical and indefensible as our own Afghan campaign, and while smarting under the consequences of that high-handed act of aggression, she displayed a temper and indulged in menaces which for the moment seemed to portend an immediate war with the Porte. A war with Turkey, which might precipitate the long-expected *culbute générale* in the East, and bring France into sharp collision with at least two great Powers in the Mediterranean, is not an enterprise into which even M. St. Hilaire could willingly be drawn, and it appears that the fears of those who predicted a Franco-Turkish war as the immediate sequel of the Tunis expedition were unfounded. It is evident, however, that Germany is nothing loath to encourage France in the development of an aggressive policy in Africa which tends to divert her attention from her lost provinces. Prince Bismarck has never made any secret of his desire to come to terms with France. He, naturally, is only too delighted to assent to an arrangement which gratifies her *amour-propre* at the expense of the Infidel, at the same time that it weakens her for offensive purposes in Europe.

Upon this simple foundation of fact the alarmist has built a portentous superstructure of fable wherewith to affright his innocent fellow-countrymen, and from which he can assail her Majesty's ministers. France, Germany, and Austria, so the story runs, and it is really a very old one, have formed an alliance, the terms of which, briefly stated, are these—Austria is to go to Salonica, Germany is to annex Holland and the Dutch Colonies, while France is to take

Morocco, Tunis, Tripoli, Egypt, and possibly Syria. We might be more uneasy if the authorities who threaten us with this predatory alliance on the part of the two great Continental States whose dominating dread is the fear of the renewal of the war of 1870, if they had not been discredited by the failure of all their predictions concerning the foreign policy of their own country. When the Suez Canal Shares were bought they were as sure that Lord Beaconsfield was going to take Egypt as they are now that the Tunis expedition is but the beginning of the conquest of Northern Africa. They believed the Salisbury Circular heralded, not the surrender of the Schouvaloff memorandum, but the annulment of Russian conquests in Turkey. They were as confident that the nation enthusiastically endorsed the invasion of Afghanistan, as they are now that the French peasant is carried away by dreams of an African India to be maintained by his taxes and garrisoned by his sons. That they were all wrong before affords no presumption that they are right now, and if they are right now, then the policy which they supported before was a disastrous, and might easily have been a fatal mistake. If France could be squared so easily by the offers of the plunder of Northern Africa, how mad, how reckless was the policy which, with such a predatory alliance on the cards, persisted in regarding Russia as the sole enemy of our Eastern Empire, and squandered millions on the Bosphorus and on Afghanistan in alienating a possible ally, and in combating a remote and visionary danger which neglects to secure the safety of the road to India.

The policy of France is aggressive, as the policy of England was aggressive three years ago. But France, like England, likes her glory cheap. The Tunisian campaign promised at first to afford an electioneering success. It was cheap, short, bloodless, and successful. But unfortunately for the schemers who projected it, although most fortunately for the nation which might have been led astray by the glitter of successful folly, the treaty had no sooner been extorted from the Bey than it was discovered that the forbidden fruit which France had seized was at the best a Dead Sea apple. Difficulties thickened around the French in Africa. A great ferment arose in all the Arab tribes, an insurrectionary movement was threatened from Morocco to Tripoli. Bou Amema, the Arab Marabout, who had raised the Southern province of Oran, raided across the Chotts, and falling upon the Spanish colonists near Saida, massacred hundreds, and drove thousands in panic to the coast, from whence they took ship to Spain. Spanish sentiment, which at first was favourable to France, became intensely hostile, and grave complaints were made of the inability of the Algerian authorities to provide full security for the Spanish settlers. The Arabs in Tunis revolted against the Bey. He sent troops to suppress the revolt, but they

refused to act against their co-religionists at the bidding of the Infidel. The French had themselves to bombard Sfax and send troops and war-ships to guard the coast. In Tripoli the measure taken by the Sultan to protect his frontier against a further development of the civilizing mission of France, has thrown oil on the flames of Arab fanaticism, and according to the French, has converted Tripoli into a centre of propaganda against French rule in Africa. The Porte has refused to recognise the *fait accompli* in Tunis, and the situation between Paris and Constantinople is seen to be exceedingly strained. The Algerian rising cannot be suppressed until the heat of the summer abates, and before it is extinguished, France is likely to lose more money—to say nothing of men—than all the profits which are likely to accrue to her speculators from the exploitation of Tunis in the lifetime of the next generation. The government of M. Ferry is not likely to reap many electoral advantages by its African policy, and it will be well for France if this sharp reminder of the perils of an aggressive Imperialism serves to deter her from pursuing a path which can only result in difficulties, and may culminate with great disaster.

Apart from the predictions of restless panic-mongers there is no reason to expect any serious difficulty in the Mediterranean. France, as soon as the mercury falls in the thermometer, will pour sufficient troops into Africa to crush the Arabs, but there is no probability that she will venture upon such a daring game as the seizure of Syria or of Egypt. The control established at Cairo by England and France is working fairly well, and is not likely to be upset excepting by a mutiny of the army, which might lead the Khedive to appeal for support to Paris and London. If a military occupation of the Nile valley becomes necessary, delicate questions would arise as to the composition of the European garrisons, but it is to be hoped that the necessity for their discussion may be averted. The chief difficulty in way of the smooth working of the arrangement is the fear excited in the minds of the Egyptian Government, that the Tunis expedition will lead to further acts of aggression nearer the Nile. As everything depends on the confidence of the Egyptian Government in the good faith of the controllers, this suspicion, which oddly enough is directed more against England than France—for it seems impossible at Cairo that we can have consented to the invasion of Tunis without taking provisions for a counterbalancing extension of our own authority in Egypt—is a grave obstacle in the way of an otherwise promising international experiment.

In Bulgaria, the raw and light-headed young Prince who violently broke up the Assembly, has replaced it by another, in which the party of national progress and de-Russianized administration has no power, partly owing to brutal intimidation and corruption of Russian

agents, and partly to the unpopularity of a system of government which was too much in advance of the social conditions of the people. Odious as are the conduct and policy of the Prince, he is backed by Russia, which may well dislike the sight of Bulgarians enjoying a freedom that is unknown in her own misgoverned land, and by the Porte, which naturally dreads the power of a popular and national party next door to East Roumelia. At Constantinople the Sultan, although preoccupied with the punishment of Midhat Pasha and the others who have been convicted of the murder of Abdul Aziz, displays a dogged determination to hold his own against France in Africa, Austria in Macedonia, and Russia in Bulgaria. He has refused to recognise the French claim to protect Tunisian subjects in Tripoli and Egypt. He still persists in his opposition to the proposed railway to Salonica, and it is reported, more or less credibly, that he is about to insist on the occupation of the Balkan passes by his garrisons. This last report can hardly be credited. The Sultan may desire to realise the precious privilege to secure which Lord Beaconsfield threatened to break up the Congress of Berlin, but he will not be permitted to carry his desire into effect. If he attempted to do so the Bulgarian situation would be speedily transformed, and the recent Revolution effected by Prince Alexander by the unanimous vote of a packed assembly would present itself to Europe in a new light. Constitution or no constitution, the ruler of Bulgaria would be compelled to resist the re-entry of the Ottoman soldiery into Eastern Roumelia, and the union of the Bulgarians in the field against the Turks would bring about the union of the provinces. It is a curious illustration of the unwisdom of the British plenipotentiaries at Berlin that the stipulation they most insisted on answers no other purpose than that of tempting the Sultan to provoke an explosion which would probably extinguish her empire in Europe.

While the Sultan is thus resisting Austria and France in their designs upon his provinces in Europe and in Africa, he has astonished his enemies by handing over Arta to Greece without even organizing a "spontaneous" opposition on the part of the inhabitants, as in the case of Dulcigno. Arta in Epirus was the point where of all others the Turks might have created difficulties for the Greeks. That the Hellenic troops were allowed to enter without firing a single shot was an agreeable surprise, which argues well for the unopposed cession of Thessaly. The Greeks are content for the present with the frontier assigned to them by the Powers, but if the Turks do not loyally execute the convention they will revive their claim to the Berlin frontier, and strike for Epirus as well as Thessaly. Possibly a knowledge of this fact may tend to facilitate the unopposed transfer of the ceded province to the Greeks.

THE

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CLXXVII. NEW SERIES.—SEPTEMBER 1, 1881.

RADICALS AND IRISH IDEAS.

LIBERALS, be they many or few, who find themselves unable to look with satisfaction upon the Irish Land Act are not in an enviable position. It is not a slight thing for men to be at issue with their party upon a question of this kind. Every Liberal would like, if he could, to bear his part in carrying a message of peace to Ireland. Every Liberal would like, if he could, to pay Mr. Gladstone's wonderful conduct of the Bill the tribute, not merely of intellectual admiration but of practical sympathy. There can hardly be an equally great achievement in store for him, and even generous adversaries must wish that the last in the long series of his Parliamentary triumphs should be one that will grow more signal as the years go on, and in the end be found as beneficent in its results as it has admittedly been brilliant in its attainment. Those of us who are unable to see what the majority of the party see in the Irish Land Act may, it is true, seek comfort in Mr. Goschen's assurance that the power to resist a stream which has carried away so many is a proof rather of strength than of weakness. There is little, however, that is pleasing in the possession of so unsociable a distinction. It is hard not to think regretfully of the time when we went with the multitude and when our place was among such as keep holy-day. Now our lot is to stand aloof in seeming sullenness, and to find fault where the mass of those with whom we have been wont to agree see only ground for praise. Isolation, however, distasteful as it undoubtedly is, brings a duty with it. Liberals who find themselves at issue with their party on a question of such exceptional importance are bound to ask themselves how it is that this has come about. Some of their friends have been ready enough to answer the question for them. A man cannot, they say, be judged till he is tried, and the Irish Land Bill is the test question of Liberal principles. He who is guilty upon this one point is guilty of all. "You have been all your lives Conservatives without knowing it, and the Irish Land Bill has only revealed that

evil leaven which has from the first been a secret element in your political creed." This disheartening view of our condition might be more impressive were it not for the increasing disposition which has of late shown itself among Liberals to invest all important controversies with this decisive and refining character. Unless, therefore, the party leaders for the time being are infallible, there may conceivably be occasions when a Liberal may differ from them even upon a test question without ceasing to be a Liberal.

When Liberals in Parliament see no reasons for opposing a measure which to some of them must seem to go in the teeth of principles older and wider than any party combination, it is open to any one in the crowd to say why and in what he thinks the Government have been in error as regards their legislation about Irish land. I esteem it a very great courtesy that the Editor has given me leave to do this in the pages of the Fortnightly Review, and I am the more glad to avail myself of his permission because there is very much in his own article in the July number with which I heartily agree. If I shared in the general Conservative objection to the Irish Land Bill, I should not be specially anxious to define the grounds of my hostility. But as regards Ireland and the treatment of Irish questions I venture to think myself more really liberal than many of the loudest supporters of the Land Bill. It is unfortunate that among those who are foremost in demanding that Ireland shall be governed by Irish ideas should be some who have hitherto been equally eager in resisting this demand. If Ireland, like Scotland, ought to have informal home rule granted to her in matters of special Irish concern, why has this concession been withheld—why is it still withheld—upon the two points as to which beyond all others a nation may expect to be given its own way? What would have been the value of the Scotch Act of Union if Scotchmen had not been enabled to endow their own church or to educate their children in schools and universities of their own making?¹ I do not ask whether in their dealings with Irish Catholicism Englishmen have done by Ireland as they would themselves wish to be done by. Considering that in England the religion of the majority is still established, and that down to a very recent time the English universities were exclusively and intimately associated with that religion, the question answers itself. What I wish to insist on is the absolute and insulting severance Englishmen have chosen to make in these two

(1) As Mr. Lathbury has referred to my article on the expediency of giving to Irishmen the same kind of self-government as we could not help giving to Scotchmen, it is perhaps not intrusive in me to say that I have always held the attitude of modern English Liberals towards Irish education to be fundamentally inconsistent with liberal principles, as well as with the accepted practice in our own country. Both Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell seem to me to have taken a much more statesman-like view of the religious question in Ireland than their successors. For the first eight pages of Mr. Lathbury's article, I go entirely with him: *my withers are unwrung*.—

respects between Scotland and Ireland—between, that is to say, two kingdoms standing to themselves in precisely similar relations, and meriting *a priori* precisely similar treatment. To make the position of Scotland at all parallel to that of Ireland, the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church after the Revolution should have involved no transfer of endowments to the Presbyterians; Scotch elementary education should have been made rigidly undenominational; and Scotch parents should have been given their choice between sending their sons to an Episcopalian university or to colleges from which the teaching of religion was altogether excluded. It is true that as regards the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, the original error was committed when Radicalism was too feeble a power to be held accountable for anything. But though the question has not been seriously before the public for many years, there has been sufficient reference to it in Radical speeches and Radical journals to show pretty clearly what would have been its reception if it had been formally raised in the House of Commons. The Radicals indeed would have been no louder in their denunciations of the scheme than Protestant Conservatives in both countries, but then Protestant Conservatives have never talked about governing Ireland by Irish ideas. The question that every politician who supported the Land Bill on this ground ought to ask himself is, Should I be prepared to carry out my own doctrine if it were proposed on the same plea to devote the surplus revenue of the disestablished Church to the endowment of the Irish Catholic clergy? If he is not prepared to do this, if on the contrary he would offer the most obstinate resistance to any such proposal, he ought to review with just suspicion his attitude towards the Land Bill. If while he is guided by Irish ideas in the one case he rejects them in the other, does his acceptance of the doctrine mean anything more than that he is willing to govern Ireland by Irish ideas when the particular Irish idea happens to be his own?

It may be objected that the question has never been a practical one within living memory, and that politicians are not bound, any more than courts of law are bound, to say what they would do in hypothetical cases. If the Radicals had been in existence at the time of the Union, or in power at the time of Roman Catholic Emancipation, they might have seen reason to put Ireland on a level as regards the endowment of religion with England and Scotland. That they have been opposed to such a policy of late years does not prove that they would have been opposed to it eighty or fifty years ago. Now that they have a good hope of putting an end to the endowment of religion in England and Scotland, to deny it to Ireland is not to subject her to any unequal treatment. It is merely to place her in advance of her sister kingdoms by giving her an earlier enjoyment of that absolute religious equality to which

England and Scotland are still making their way. But on this theory what becomes of the principle of governing Ireland by Irish ideas? How many English Radicals have ever asked themselves whether, if the Irish people had been left free to determine what should be done with the surplus revenues of the Protestant Church, they would have appropriated them to the endowment of their own religion? How many of those who have put this question to themselves have answered it in the only way in which they can answer it consistently? To plead that religious endowments are bad things in themselves, and that instead of re-establishing them in Ireland, Radicals ought to be pulling them down in England and Scotland, is nothing to the purpose. Interference with freedom of contract and the virtual abolition of absolute ownership are presumably bad things in themselves, but they are declared to be good in Ireland because they will tend to bring the land system into closer conformity with Irish opinion. If there is one subject more than another on which national opinion ought to have the freest possible play it is upon subjects connected with the national religion.

As regards Irish Education Radicals cannot even plead that the question had been virtually decided before their time. There is not a single aspect of this controversy upon which Irish ideas have not been set at defiance by one English Ministry or another, and whether these Ministries have been Conservative or Liberal, they have always been able to count upon Radical support, while in the one conspicuous instance in which an English Ministry has ever tried to take Irish ideas upon this subject into account, it was defeated by Radical opposition. When Sir Robert Peel went counter to all the principles which the Conservatives professed to hold most sacred, and founded the Queen's Colleges, nothing was heard from the Radicals about governing Ireland by Irish ideas. They had ample evidence that the Queen's Colleges were disliked in Ireland. They saw that Irish parents, who have never been disposed to undervalue education for their sons, showed no appreciation of it when it came to them in this form. Nobody pretended that the Queen's Colleges gave Irishmen the education they desired. The argument used in their behalf was always that they gave Irishmen the education which, however much they might detest it, was really the best for them. When Lord Palmerston refused with exceptional persistence to give the Catholic University of Ireland a charter, he found the Radicals of one mind with himself. In this case the Irish demand had nothing to do with money. What was asked for the Catholic University was not an endowment, but simply leave to grant degrees which should be recognised by the State in the same way as the degrees of other Universities are recognised. An attempt was made to justify the refusal of this permission on the ground that the quality of the

education given would be inferior because it was Catholic. Considering the part which Catholicism has played in European education generally, and the part which Cardinal Newman had taken in the founding of this particular University, this objection savoured somewhat of impertinence. But even if it had been well founded it was irrelevant. There was nothing to prevent the State from distinguishing the degrees given by the Catholic University of Ireland from the degrees given by other Universities in any way it chose. Some means of differentiating the slender allowance of scholarship possessed by its graduates from the comprehensive intellectual equipment which is associated with a pass degree at Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, or Durham, could easily have been devised, and then the Government would have delivered its conscience, and might have felt at liberty to allow the Irish people to educate their children in their own meagre fashion. Instead of this, Lord Palmerston frankly said that he disliked denominational education, and left it to be inferred that what he disliked Irishmen must be content to forego. Ireland was to be governed, not by Irish ideas but by Palmerstonian ideas. How many Radicals protested against this insolent pretension on the part of the Prime Minister? Upon other matters they were ready enough to oppose Lord Palmerston, but when he insisted that Irish education should be cast in a shape which was distasteful to the great body of the Irish nation, and would at that time have been almost equally distasteful to the great body of the English and Scotch nations, his counsel was as if a man had inquired at the oracle of God. The ideas on which the Radicals thought that Ireland should be governed were neither Irish nor English. They were wholly destitute of any national or local colour, and embodied nothing but an ignoble compromise between doctrinaire secularism and Protestant prejudice.

Ignoble as it was, however, the Radicals loved it well enough to risk the immediate, and precipitate the eventual, overthrow of Mr. Gladstone's first Administration rather than consent to abandon it. No one can feel much admiration for the Irish University Bill of 1873. The Cabinet which introduced it was doubtless as conscious of its faults as any of its critics. It gave the Irish very much less than they had a fair right to ask, and in order to induce the House of Commons to do even this amount of justice, educational provisions of a highly damaging kind were introduced into it. Still, whatever may have been its faults, the Bill was an honest attempt to redress a real and crying wrong. Its imperfections as regards scope and method were only concessions to the practical necessity of making it palatable to the majority in Parliament. The Radicals had steadily refused to allow Irishmen to have their sons taught history and philosophy by teachers in whom they had confidence. Consequently the Government proposed that for a time history and philosophy should be omitted from

the University course. But the Radicals could not endure even this fragment of concession to Irish ideas. Secularism in its most austere and unbending form was the educational creed that must be imposed upon Ireland. If the Irish disliked it, so much the worse for them. The English Liberal party could make no allowances and accord no toleration on this score. Education was not worth having, and consequently not worth giving, unless it was entirely dissociated from religion. As the Irish people for the most part declined to accept it in this form they must be left to instruct their children as they best could. This persistent disregard of Irish ideas, while dealing with Irish education, has sometimes been defended on the plea that the Irish are not masters of their own wills. They desire and labour to get not the things which they themselves care for, but the things which their clergy tell them they ought to care for. They are a priest-ridden people, and the less of its own way a priest-ridden people gets the better and happier it will be. Whatever may be the value of this reasoning in the mouths of those who maintain that the object of Imperial legislation upon Irish questions should be the promotion of what the majority in the Imperial Parliament thinks good for Ireland, it can have no meaning in the mouth of a party which professes to wish to govern Ireland by Irish ideas. For them the point to be ascertained is not whether the belief that a man will suffer eternally if he disobeys his priest, is false or degrading, but whether it is or is not an Irish idea, and the very assertion that the Irish are priest-ridden is almost tantamount to an admission that it is so. If it be right to give Irishmen what they want as regards the land, though what they want may involve a return to an earlier and less perfect phase of social economy, how can it be other than right to give them what they want as regards education? Why is the conviction of the Irish tenant that he has a property in land which he has never bought, to be held worthy of all respect, and the conviction of this same tenant that it would be a sin against his Maker to send his son to a non-Catholic college to be treated as a mere superstitious survival? Both are Irish ideas, and if the first is a proper starting-point for legislation, the second must be so likewise.

There are two reasons for thus insisting upon the inconsistency of the majority of Radical politicians in regard to these questions. In the first place it greatly affects the worth of their criticism upon those Liberals who cannot admire the Land Act. At the worst we are only in the same boat with those who have shown themselves immovably opposed to the endowment of the Irish National Church, and to the freedom of Irish education. If ever there were matters which nearly and keenly interested the Irish people, they have been religion and education. Consequently the man who says that he could never be a party to the appropriation of

the surplus revenues of the disestablished Church to the support of the Roman Catholic clergy, or that he cannot recognise the degrees of any newly-formed Irish University unless they are open to students of all religions, is, as regards his deference to Irish ideas, no better than the Whigs whom he despises. If they are narrow, so is he; if they refuse to look facts in the face and to adopt legislation to the specific circumstances and history of the people for whom it is intended, so does he. I am quite willing to make every allowance for what I hold to be his narrowness and want of statesmanship. When he declares that it is against his principles to give public money to religious purposes, or to dignify by State recognition a mischievous system of education, I entirely believe him. I think him prejudiced and inconsistent, but I understand that these formulas, which to me seem so barren, are to him instinct with meaning. Though his acceptance of them constitutes, in my judgment, a serious disqualification for the work of legislating for Ireland, I admit that when a man is very much in earnest he is not likely to ask whether the ideas he is combating with all his strength are of English or Irish origin. All that I contend is, that in holding these views he has all his life been, and still is, false to the principles which he is now seeking to make an exclusive test of Liberalism. He has resisted all proposals to govern Ireland by Irish ideas, and in so doing he has laid himself open to the suspicion that the secret of his sudden and limited conversion is to be sought rather in his hatred of landlords than in his love of Irishmen.

In the second place, in so far as the Radicals have set themselves against the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church and the freedom of Roman Catholic education, they are largely responsible for the state of things with which the Imperial Parliament has lately been called upon to deal. What has been the principal cause of the alienation of the Irish tenant from the Irish landlord? The fact that the landlord minority belonged, as a rule, to one religion, while the tenant majority belonged to another, and that the religion of the minority, not that of the majority, was the religion honoured and enriched by the State. It was this that gave its sting to the difference of creed. The Scotch tenant has never been troubled by the fact that his landlord is an Episcopalian. He may think that it bodes ill for the landlord's state in the next world, but it has not disturbed their friendly relations in this one. If the ecclesiastical and educational position of Ireland had been identical with that of Scotland, Protestant ascendancy would never have been heard of. If at the time of the Union or of Roman Catholic emancipation a serious effort had been made to assimilate the two countries in these respects, the mischievous effects of Protestant ascendancy might long ago have been abated. It is impossible to overrate the change which

would have been wrought in the feelings of the tenants if they had been able to regard their landlords as members of a church which, though established in England, was in Ireland only a form of dissent, and had seen all the external dignity that endowment can give reserved for the Church to which they themselves belong. It is often said that the disestablishment of the Irish Church has done little to make the Irish people more contented. It is natural enough that Roman Catholics should think this, but even those who, like myself, are not Roman Catholics, would have no right to be surprised if it had done absolutely nothing. The religion for which the Irish people cherish a traditional and passionate regard has been in no way the better for the change. The historic fabrics of Irish Christianity have not been made over to their former owners. Even in Dublin, where the existence of two cathedrals seemed to demand that one of them should be given to the Roman Catholics, both were retained by a Church which had always shown itself singularly indifferent to the majesty, if not to the decencies, of worship. If the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin had again said mass at St. Patrick's or Christ Church, if the Lord Lieutenant had ordinarily been chosen from among the Irish Catholic peers, and the chapel of Dublin Castle had become what as the Chapel Royal of a Catholic nation it naturally would be, the impression of equality with England conveyed to the Irish people would have been immense. The very point which in the worst times was most typical of their oppressed and degraded condition, and which in the better times that have succeeded has been most persistent among the lingering evils associated with it, would have been the point singled out for the most conspicuous amendment and redress. It is hard to set bounds, even in imagination, to the sense of reconciliation which such a policy as this might by degrees have created among Irishmen. The fact that the religion of which they are proud, but which all around them have regarded as making them objects of contempt or compassion, had been restored to its natural place as the religion of the Irish nation would have been one that they could not have overlooked. The change would have appealed to the imagination and the eye, and with a sensitive people like the Irish the imagination and the eye may sometimes go further than either the reason or the pocket. In essentials no doubt equality is a sufficient remedy for ascendancy, but where externals are concerned, something more than equality may be wanted. In England and Scotland the majority has been left free to enjoy the advantages of its position. It has endowed its own religion, and sought degrees at the hands of Universities in which that religion is taught and honoured. In Ireland, on the contrary, these advantages have been denied to the majority. Is it wonderful that Irishmen have not yet realised that the intention of all recent legislation has been to make them the

equals of Englishmen and Scotchmen? They have preferred to judge the tree by its fruit.

It will be said, no doubt, and said quite truly, that this is a mere dream. The Protestant feeling of England would never have endured so marked a display of favour towards Roman Catholicism. No Government which made such a suggestion could possibly have retained office long enough to give it effect, and unless their party had altogether repudiated the idea, it must have been content to endure exclusion from power for a long period of years. I am not concerned to deny this. The English Radicals are to blame, not because they have not achieved impossibilities, but because they have shown no desire to achieve them. They have had abundance of practice in discriminating between things which they would like to do if they could, and things which they intend to do when they can. My complaint is that they have not placed the endowment of the Irish Catholic Church or the incorporation of the Irish Catholic University in the first of these categories. More than this, they have left no man in doubt as to their determination to oppose such concessions by all the means they can command. They have refused to apply to religion and education their own canon about governing Ireland by Irish ideas, and by this refusal they have put it beyond their power to find fault—except at the price of a total disregard of consistency—with those who demur to the application of that same canon to questions which, when the most has been said for them, are of no greater moment than those with which I have been dealing.

It is not, however, upon this ground that I propose to justify the dislike which some Liberals feel to the Irish Land Act. Hitherto I have only tried to show that the dissident Liberals have at all events the advantage of consistency over their Radical critics. That plea is plainly open to the answer that, though the Radicals may have been wrong upon points of greater intrinsic moment, they are, nevertheless, right upon the point of most immediate moment; and that those who maintain that Irish ideas ought long ago to have been deferred to as regards religion and education are not the persons to complain because these ideas have at length been taken into account as regards the tenure of land. This is not a contention of which I care to dispute the force. I do not urge it as an objection to the Land Act that it is conceived in deference to Irish ideas, or that its provisions are not such as Liberals would wish to see imported into England. I know of no trustworthy receipt for insuring the success of legislation which does not include the condition that it shall be in harmony with the public opinion of the country to which it is to be applied, nor can I distinguish between the public opinion of a country and the ideas of a people. Even the most thorough-going assailants of the Act do not maintain that this objection is of

universal application. It is not usually alleged as a fault in laws made for England that they are in harmony with English ideas; that is rather thought to be a qualification which must on no account be wanting if the laws are to answer their purpose. Nor can I see that the circumstance that Ireland is a part of the United Kingdom necessarily excepts her from the convenient rule that the best land system is that which best suits the particular stage and form of civilisation to which it is to be applied. When I am told that the land laws hitherto in force in Ireland have been too closely copied from those of England, I am quite ready to believe it. The difference between the two countries as regards soil, climate, and national character and history is so great that I should be prepared to expect that the land laws suited to them would be different also. Nor again is it necessarily a fault in the Act that the system it introduces is theoretically less perfect than that which it supersedes. If we were mistaken in the first instance in assimilating the Irish land system to that of England, the question we should ask ourselves is whether this is a subsisting blunder, or a blunder the effects of which have been exhausted. If it is a subsisting blunder—if, that is, the more advanced system is still unsuited to the less advanced country—it may be wise even now to undo our work, to see facts as they are, and to give Ireland a land system suited to her needs, though these needs be the needs of the child rather than of the grown man. Irishmen ought to know their own country better than Englishmen can know it, and if it should appear that Irishmen generally, or the Irishmen whose judgment upon the affairs of their own country is usually soundest, are of opinion that certain provisions will more than any others insure the end which all legislation for Ireland ought to have in view, Englishmen will ordinarily be well advised in taking these views rather than any they may themselves hold as a basis of Irish legislation. So far, I agree with the principles on which the Land Act is professedly founded.

Assuming, then, that Irish legislation should, as a general rule, be the expression of Irish ideas, ought the Land Act to be accepted as a legitimate application of the rule? In answering this question it will not be necessary to go into any minute discussion of what the Act professes to do. Friends and foes are at least agreed that it aims at giving the tenant security of tenure by restraining the power of eviction hitherto possessed by the landlord, and by depriving him of the right to ask, in theory any rent he chooses, and in practice any rent which, looking at the state of the land market, he thinks that he is likely to get. The first thing I have to say of the Act as thus described is, that it strains the rule of legislating by Irish ideas to a very remarkable extent. A nurse

who had been instructed by the doctor to give the patient anything he asked for, might excusably hesitate if the patient's first request was for something which she believed to be poison. The effect of this measure will be to introduce into Ireland a land system of which the world has never seen the like. It goes in the teeth of all the experience which mankind has been slowly accumulating with regard to property in the soil. That experience may be summed up in a single phrase, the benefit of ownership. The invigorating yet sobering effect which ownership of land exercises has become a commonplace with politicians of all schools. The economist points to the encouragement it gives to thrift. The Conservative thinks of the dislike to revolution which it engenders even in those who originally obtained their land by revolutionary methods. The Liberal is attracted by the fusion of classes likely to arise from the wide distribution of the most conspicuous, the most interesting, and the most dignified form of property. One school is pleased because the democracy is made territorial, another because the territorial element is made democratic. Now, in Ireland, under the Land Act, ownership will, in the majority of cases, be as good as abolished. The land will not, in the true and complete acceptation of the word, be the property of any one. The test of ownership is an exceedingly simple one. That and that only is a man's own which he is free to do what he likes with, except so far as he has limited his freedom by contract. Applying this test to the tenure created by the Act, in whom can it be said that the ownership of land in Ireland will henceforth be vested? Until now there has been no difficulty in giving an answer. The land belonged to the landlord. He was free, independently of any agreement he might have made to the contrary, to leave it in the occupation of the existing tenants, or to substitute other tenants for them, or to take it into his own hands, and either farm it himself or relet it. He was free, except in Ulster, where a contrary custom had grown up with his consent or by his neglect, to choose his own tenants and to let his land for whatever time and at whatever rent it pleased him to let it. The Act of 1870 indeed had attached certain penalties to the exercise of this power, but it had left the power itself in being. The landlord, on grounds of public policy, was made to pay for his freedom, but subject to this indirect restraint he still enjoyed it. Under the Act of 1881 he will enjoy it no longer. The power of eviction—that is of determining to whom and for how long a time he will part with his land—is taken away, and the power of raising the rent—that is of determining what price he will ask for the temporary usufruct of the land—is taken away also. It was necessary, no doubt, to make both these changes if the tenant was to have security of tenure given to him. All that I contend is, that security as regards the tenant is destruction of ownership as regards

the landlord. He will be the owner of the land in name, but he will be unable to exercise the most valuable rights of ownership, or to appeal to the sanctions by which those rights are most effectually enforced. Yet the ownership will not be made over to the tenant. If it were, I should under this head have no fault to find with the Act. Unfortunately, however, the tenant, though he will be able to exercise many of the rights which ordinarily belong to ownership, will still be denied others which equally belong to it. He will hold the land on condition of paying rent for it—and to an Irishman the payment of rent marks more than anything else the dividing line between ownership and non-ownership—and under certain circumstances he can be evicted. That the substance of ownership will, in a great measure, belong to the tenant I am not concerned to deny; but it is a mistake to deal with any nation, most of all perhaps with the Irish nation, as though the substance were all that need be thought of. If ownership is to exercise a really wholesome influence in Ireland, the form and the substance ought to go together.

Under the Land Act, moreover, they will not be merely dissociated. They will be presented in positive antagonism. The nominal owner will remain on the land, inheriting all the unpopularity with which a bad tradition has surrounded him, and at the same time made to furnish the tenant with a new and powerful motive for getting rid of him. Until now he has had power to annoy, and consequently he has been worth conciliating. In future he will be harmless, and therefore unimportant. He will continue to live on the property, but except in a few reserved cases he will live on it simply as a looker-on. If his function were merely to loaf about with nothing to do and nothing to get, this state of things might do no particular injury. Though the Irish landlord of the future would be neither an imposing nor a profitable institution, he might at all events be an innocent one. But the Act leaves him invested with a function which the tenant is not at all likely to regard as innocent. The landlord will have only a rent-charge on the land, but in virtue of that charge he will draw rent. His hand will be in every man's pocket, and an Irish tenant will certainly regard a hand so placed as a hand raised against him. The best thing that can be hoped under the Act is that Irish landlords will largely become absentees, since in that event the comparatively impersonal agent will be substituted for the personal cumberer of the ground. But in the majority of cases the Irish landlord will be too poor to be an absentee. He will remain on the estate which was once his, as an irritating reminder to the tenant how incomplete his emancipation has been. Does a settlement of which this is a principal incident offer any reasonable prospect of giving peace to Ireland? All that it seems to me to do is to provide the Irish tenant with what, from his point of view, will

be a reasonable ground for further agitation. The Land Act will have established the fact that in the view of the law, occupation creates a part ownership of the soil, and it invests the occupier with all the comely incidents of ownership. To the landlord is left the uncomely part of taking money for which he will appear to give nothing in return. No doubt this will not be a true description of his relation to the tenant, inasmuch as he will still give the most essential element in the whole transaction, the possession of the land. If the rent is not paid, the landlord will retain the right of eviction, and in that sense the rent will still be drawn in return for leave to occupy the holding. But under the Land Act, the connection between the two halves of the process will be as much as possible obscured. The landlord will seem to the tenant to have no more claim against him than any other creditor, while he will differ from all other creditors in that for the money owing to them they have given the tenant something which he could not have got without their permission, whereas the landlord has only given the land which the tenant will now regard himself as holding by permission of the State, or more probably of the Land League. When once the Irish tenants have taken in that the landlords are simply incumbrances, they are not, to judge from past experience, at all likely to sit down patiently under the burden. They have got, as they will put it, the land, and so far their long labour has been successful. But they have got it so saddled as to make the enjoyment of it little more than nominal, and the next thing for them to do will be to turn the name into a reality. Nor will the powerful ally who has helped the tenants in the past be wanting to them in the future. Mr. Parnell, as we know, would never have taken off his coat on behalf of the Land League if he had not believed that the question of tenure could be made to minister to the cause of Home Rule. But the cause of Home Rule will not be really helped by any agitation which does not commit the tenant to some demand in connection with the land which the Imperial Parliament will refuse. It would be rash, no doubt, to say beforehand what the Imperial Parliament will refuse, but it is pretty certain that it will draw a line somewhere, and that Mr. Parnell will in the end be able to point to a concession upon which the Irish tenant has set his heart, but which he cannot hope to get until he has a legislature of his own. Mr. Parnell, therefore, will have precisely the same motive for starting a new agitation that he had for starting the former one. The two elements in which the Land League had its origin will again be in conjunction, to give birth in due time to some yet more monstrous offspring. What the Land Act does, therefore, is to give Ireland a land system which has no intrinsic merit, while it is certain to become the starting-point of a new movement as menacing to public order and national prosperity

as the one which has been so troublesome during the past twelve months. When Englishmen are asked to assent to this, on the plea that Ireland should be governed by Irish ideas, it is not strange if some of them feel that the first complete application of the principle is one that displays it in its least inviting colours. The patient is tormented with a raging thirst, and the only drink that he demands at the nurse's hand is a new and potent form of alcohol.

In the next place there is no evidence that the Land Bill is really the expression of the best Irish ideas, or indeed of any considerable number of Irish ideas of any kind. In disproof of this statement I shall be referred perhaps to the report of the Bessborough Commission. But I venture to say that the Bessborough Commission will live by the reports of the two dissentient members. For myself, I was inclined, until those reports appeared, to regard the determination of rent by a court as under the circumstances the least objectionable expedient that could be suggested. I was brought round to the opposite view by the masterly argument of the O'Connor Don, and though I have looked carefully for some answer to his reasoning, I have never seen one given, or even attempted. Englishmen who accept the doctrine that Irish legislation should be based upon Irish ideas may still demur when they are bidden to take the ideas of three Irishmen in preference to the ideas of two, without any reference whatever to the quality of the ideas. But even as regards the report of the majority of the Bessborough Commission—speaking of it without reference to its singular treatment of rebutting testimony, or to its weakness for leading questions—I feel no confidence that it represents the genuine opinion of its authors on the best land system for Ireland. It is far more probable that it represents a very different thing—the opinion of its authors as to the maximum of concession that a Liberal Government was likely to propose, or a Liberal House of Commons likely to accept. “In the case of the Land Bill,” says Mr. Morley, in the article to which I have already referred, “the present writer is not the only person who is firmly convinced, after a tolerably attentive observation of what has gone on, that if the whole body of Irish members had been sent upstairs to work out a Land Bill of their own, whether at the initiative of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Plunket, or of Mr. Litton, Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Parnell, they would in less time have produced a more effective, and possibly a more just, measure than that which the collective wisdom of the two Houses will by-and-by send limping and halt-footed into the world.” Supposing that this had been done—in the case of a Scotch Land Bill it would have been done to a considerable extent—the Irish members would probably have argued thus: “The point upon which there is the largest measure of agreement is the expediency of increasing the number of Irish proprietors. We are all—from Mr. Gibson to

Mr. Parnell—anxious to do this, and we all admit that it must be done upon the principle of buying out the landlord. Where we differ is as to the precise terms on which he ought to be bought out, but though the settlement of this question may involve a great deal of troublesome actuarial detail, it is not beyond the scope of reasonable and friendly arrangement.” Now a proposal of this kind, supposing the details of it had involved no injustice to the landlord, is one upon which Irish ideas, Irish tastes, and even Irish prejudices have, as it seems to me, a just claim to be considered. A nation may fairly ask to be made happy in its own way, rather than in a way which may seem better to some other nation. If Irishmen prefer that their country should be one in which variety of agriculture and a wide distribution of property in land enable a large population to lead a hard but not unlovely life, I know of no reason why Englishmen should try to convert Ireland into a country in which large farms almost exclusively devoted to grazing may enable a small population to live in comparative wealth. If they think it important that Irishmen should be brought to take this latter view, by all means let them try their hands at converting them. But they should address themselves to the task with an underlying recollection that they speak only as advocates, and that as Englishmen they cannot, in the last resort, be the most competent judges of the conditions of life in Ireland. In the present case, unfortunately, Irishmen have not been left to decide the question for themselves. What has been offered them is a too-ingenious compound, in which ideas derived from one land system are embodied in forms borrowed from another. Legislation of this kind is no real approach to the government of Ireland by Irish ideas. It is simply another attempt to govern Ireland by English ideas—the difference being that this time the English ideas profess to be Irish, while they really stand to them in much the same relation as that which the customary Irishman of the English stage bears to the genuine Connemara peasant.

In the third place, whatever be the degree of deference which Parliament is bound to pay to Irish ideas in matters of purely Irish concern, it is equally bound to take care that these ideas are not carried out at the cost of injustice to individuals. Every man is responsible for that which he could have prevented had he chosen to prevent it. It is open to us to allow those under our control to do foolish things, because this may sometimes be the best means of teaching them wisdom; but it is not open to us to allow them to gain this wisdom at the cost of other people. Besides this general title to protection Irish landlords have a special claim upon us because they are in a great measure the creatures of English legislation. In earlier days they were regarded as an English garrison, in later

times they have been regarded as a species of economical missionary ; and in both characters they have a peculiar title to the compensation which the State ordinarily offers to those whom it calls upon to surrender their property for the public good. I know that it is denied that the landlords of Ireland have any claim to compensation. But this denial seems to involve a confusion between what a man actually has in the present and what it is considered advantageous to the community that he should have in the future. When a railway company takes land under its powers of compulsory purchase, it may be argued that the owner will benefit, as passenger or trader, by the increased facilities of communication which the opening of the line will afford him, but we do not leave him to look to those increased facilities for compensation for the land taken. To tell Irish landlords that Ireland will be more prosperous under the Land Act than she has ever been before, and that as Irishmen they will necessarily be benefited by anything that benefits Ireland, is very much the same thing as telling the owner of land wanted for a railway that he will have a station within a hundred yards of his door instead of having as now to drive eight miles before he can find a train. Such an owner would have two perfectly good answers to make. He might say, first, that it was for him, not for the railway company or the State, to decide whether the land or the station was of most value to him ; and secondly, that since his neighbours would enjoy the station equally with himself, and yet have given up no land in order to get it, it was not fair that he alone should pay for what the rest of the world gets for nothing. An Irish landlord may make a similar objection to the Land Act. The land system we have introduced into Ireland may be all that its most enthusiastic friends proclaim it to be. It may make Ireland a garden and Irishmen a happy family. But it is not the system under which we have encouraged landlords to buy and keep estates, and in so far as the difference makes to their disadvantage their claim to compensation is identical with that of the owners of land taken for a railway.

It is true the nature and amount of the injury are different in different cases. Upon an estate managed on the English fashion—an estate in which the landlord makes all necessary improvements, picks out the best and most industrious tenants, holds himself bound to see to the general welfare of the estate and not merely to the punctual payment of his rent, and generally regards himself as a partner with the tenant in the business of farming—fixity of tenure will effect a far more serious change than upon an estate managed in the Irish fashion, where the landlord considers his duty pretty well discharged when he has given the tenant a receipt, spoken pleasantly to the wife, and sent the children milk or medicine from the great house. In the former case the landlord suffers one of the worst injuries that can be done to

a man. He is deprived of his career. He is left with his rent, it may be, more regularly paid than before, but he is left with nothing to occupy him from one rent day to another. The tenant whom he may have determined to get rid of because he cannot be taught to do justice to the land is now as firmly planted on it as he is himself. The clever farmer to whom he had meant to offer the vacant farm is now completely out of his reach. The estate which he hoped to make the most productive and the best-managed in the whole country-side will now be productive or unproductive, well-managed or ill-managed, not as he shall decide, but as the tenants shall decide—tenants, be it remembered, not necessarily of his own choosing, but such as happened to be in occupation of the land at the moment of the passing of the Land Act. How can it be said that this man has sustained no injury? It would be as near the truth to say that Mr. Gladstone would sustain no injury if his pay as Prime Minister were secured to him for the remainder of his life, but he were forbidden to make a single speech or frame a single measure. If it is for the interest of the community that this class of landlord shall cease to exist in Ireland, he ought, at all events, to have the full value of his land given to him, and be left free to begin life again under conditions that will not assign him the drone's place in the hive. But the claims of the Irish landlords do not stop here. Even the least attractive of all the imaginary types that can be suggested—the hard money-grubbing landlord, who looks on his land simply as an investment and puts his rent at the very highest figure that he thinks a tenant can be got to pay—has a right to bare justice, and, so far as I can see, he must put up under the Land Act with something less than bare justice. He has bought his land as a corn merchant buys wheat. English economists and English legislators have encouraged him to treat the two transactions as identical, and now he learns for the first time that they are to be treated as essentially different. The corn merchant, in the future as in the past, may weigh the prospects of the harvest and ask much or little for his goods according to the result of his calculation. The landlord alone is to be forbidden to take advantage of a scanty supply or to raise his price in proportion as the demand increases. I say nothing against the propriety of drawing such a distinction in the future. But I do say that to set it up suddenly after ignoring it for generations, and to give no compensation to those who have bought or held land in the full belief that the law would continue to treat it as any other form of property, is to compass the good of the community at the cost of a single class.

D. C. LATHBURY.

BULGARIA.

IN the indictment which Prince Alexander framed on the 9th of May against the Constitution under which he had sworn to rule, he denounced it as being unsuited to the requirements of the country, and as having brought discredit upon Bulgaria abroad, and bred disorganisation at home. The Prince being both prosecutor and judge, there was no need to adduce evidence in support of these charges. Condemnation was pronounced, and effectual measures having been taken to insure the confirmation of the sentence by the Great National Assembly, it was duly carried into execution on the 13th of July at Sistova. The Bulgarian Constitution is dead and buried. But it may not be too late to redeem its memory from the charges to which it fell a victim, by a short review of the results which it bequeathed to Bulgaria after two short years of life.

"The Bulgarian Constitution," it has been asserted, "was foredoomed to failure; it was a foolish attempt to give to the people powers for the exercise of which they were unripe; it was exaggeratedly democratic." Such propositions are more easily advanced than maintained. From an Austrian or Russian point of view it may be that the Bulgarian Constitution was exaggeratedly democratic, but was it so in the eyes of the Bulgarians for whom, and not for Austrians or Russians, it was framed? The Marquis of Bath tells us in his excellent *Observations on Bulgarian Affairs*, that the Bulgarians have always held tenaciously "to social institutions more democratic than those which prevail in any of the older-established European countries. They have been accustomed to a large amount of local self-government; for whatever may have been the oppression of the Porte, it contemptuously allowed them by communal and municipal institutions of their own to settle their internal affairs among themselves." The first victory of democracy in Bulgaria was won while Turkish rule was yet supreme. Bulgaria was then groaning under the double thralldom of the Porte and of the Phanar. It was with the latter that the growing strength of Bulgarian democracy first measured itself. When the Phanariot bishops, who have been stigmatized, not unaptly, as spiritual Pashas, were swept out of Bulgaria, it was not to ecclesiastical or political intrigues that they succumbed, but to the overwhelming force of popular feeling against which even the secular arm of Stamboul was powerless to support them. When the Turkish Pashas followed a few years later in the wake of their Greek clerical colleagues, the same spirit which had inspired the religious revolution in Bulgaria presided over the creation of its new political institutions. Indeed, they can scarcely be said to have been created. They were merely the natural result of a logical development of the principles already embodied in

municipal and communal institutions. Even manhood suffrage, the corner-stone of the Constitution, and which as such has been so fiercely attacked and ridiculed by its opponents, was no hasty innovation, but only the confirmation of the right which every Bulgarian had hitherto enjoyed of having a voice in the settlement of the affairs of his community. The action of the Prince has at least shown that he correctly appreciated this fact. No constitution can exist in Bulgaria which is not democratic. He cannot (or will not?) govern with a democratic constitution. Argal, he must govern without any constitution at all. There was indeed another conclusion which he might have drawn from those premises, viz. that he should cease to govern. But such a conclusion was scarcely likely to commend itself to a Prussian Lieutenant of the Guards, reared in the traditions of the right divine of Princes.

"But allowing," it has been said, "that the Constitution was theoretically sound, experience has shown it to be unsound in practice. The Assembly, stocked with illiterate deputies, proved itself incapable of useful legislation, and wasted its time in sterile party strife. The Administration was incompetent and corrupt. The Government was absorbed in petty intrigues to preserve its tenure of power at home, and compromised the very existence of Bulgaria by its obstructive policy abroad." Each of these assertions, it must be confessed, is leavened with a certain measure of truth, but not with a sufficient measure to justify the conclusions to which they are intended to lead up. The most that can be made out of them is that the Constitution should have been, not abrogated, but amended; and so much its most strenuous supporters were willing to concede.

Without affirming that no good can come out of Assemblies composed in part of illiterate members, it may be admitted that they are not a desirable element, and that their numbers should be reduced as rapidly as possible. The educated classes in Bulgaria will not, however, until the rising generation has attained to manhood, be sufficiently numerous to exclude illiterate members from an Assembly, so long as the present number of deputies (1 to 10,000 electors) is maintained. The true remedy to this evil was not to abolish the Assembly upon the verdict of another Assembly composed of a far larger proportion of illiterate members than had ever been elected before, but to reduce the number of its members: and this was the remedy proposed by the Liberal leaders. Another evil of which much has been made was the large contingent of deputies furnished by the Administration. To this evil also the Liberal leaders proposed a remedy, viz. to fix the age at which citizens become eligible for the Assembly at 25 instead of 30, a measure which would have at once opened the doors of Parliament to a number of young men who would have completed their education abroad, and who might already do good service to their country, and

which would at the same time have facilitated the gradual exclusion of the various sections of public functionaries.

If precious time was wasted by the former Assembly in party strife, the responsibility does not lie with the Constitution or the Constitutional party, but with the Prince, who, in direct opposition to the spirit of the Constitution, persisted for more than a year in choosing his ministers from the parliamentary minority. As soon as he abandoned this course and allowed the formation of a Liberal Cabinet, supported by the Liberal majority, the strife ceased, and the Assembly devoted itself without further loss of time to the task of legislation. That its efforts in this direction were not always successful is a matter neither for surprise nor for indignation. Energy there was in abundance. It is sufficiently evidenced by the 27 Bills which the late Assembly passed in a period of eight months. But it was sometimes misdirected. There was a lack of experience which no honesty of purpose or strength of will can replace. Still, good work was often done, and the measures to promote national education and to raise the moral and financial condition of the clergy and protect them against the abuses of their hierarchical superiors, were steps in the right direction. To overcome the technical difficulties of its task, which the Government was the first to acknowledge, it proposed to have recourse to the services of foreign specialists who would have formed a permanent Legislative Committee under the inspiration and responsibility of the Cabinet. But to this, as well as to the other reforms above referred to, the Prince persistently turned a deaf ear. The Constitution was not to be shorn of the blemishes which were wanted as pretexts for its condemnation.

The Liberal Administration has been accused of incompetency and corruption. When the Liberals came to power they were aware of the Prince's schemes against the Constitution, for he had been at no pains to conceal them, and it was an open secret that their accomplishment had only been postponed in consequence of a double rebuff which his overtures at St. Petersburg had twice received from Alexander II. To secure the Constitution against an ulterior *coup de main* seemed to the Liberal leaders a duty of primary importance, and they hastened to fill the Administration from top to bottom with a staff which could be relied upon in the hour of danger. As in all such cases where political considerations rather than intrinsic qualifications determine public appointments, many of them were open to exception, and when derelictions of duty were brought to the notice of the Government, it had not the courage to punish them with adequate severity, especially in cases where the delinquents enjoyed a local influence which might be needed at any moment should the electoral question be put to the country, "Prince or Constitution?" This much being admitted, it may be confidently asserted that such

exceptions were not sufficiently common to affect the general character of the Administration, and that, in point of honesty and ability, it could compare not unfavourably with that of other young Oriental States such as Servia, and even Greece, which have enjoyed a much longer term of independence and political education. But by the fruits shall we judge of the tree.

The finances of a State are generally admitted to afford a fair criterion of its prosperity. When the Russian occupation ceased, and Bulgaria entered upon her new lease of constitutional existence, Prince Doudoukow-Korsakow left in the treasury of the Principality the sum of 12,000,000 francs as the surplus obtained during his administration. During its first year's tenure of power, the Conservative Government managed to reduce this surplus by five millions, and when it at last made room for a Liberal Administration, it bequeathed to the latter a Budget already framed for the current financial year which promised a further deficit of three millions, the expenditure being estimated at 19,000,000 francs and the revenue at 16,000,000. The Liberal Government did not hesitate to annul this Budget, substituting one in which revenue and expenditure were balanced at the figure of 27,000,000. Thanks to an honest administration and to a redistribution rather than an increase of taxation, and favoured by a splendid harvest, their sanguine anticipations were more than realised. In the following year, shortly before their dismissal from office, they laid before the Prince their new Budget, in which revenue and expenditure were estimated at a further increase of three millions, viz. 30,000,000 francs, and as tangible evidence of their financial success, they left in the treasury a surplus of 17,000,000 in cash, or exactly 10,000,000 more than they had found there, besides outstanding sums amounting to five or six millions still to be collected. And this result was obtained while the taxation of the country was one-third lower than under Turkish rule, not to speak of the difference between the regularity now, and the irregularity then, of the modes of levying it.

Nor was the public wealth which these returns attested applied to unproductive purposes. The task of educating the country up to the level of the liberties which it enjoyed was naturally the first to commend itself to the consideration of a Government whose members had for the most part laboured in that field to prepare the way for the national revival, long before they ever dreamed of guiding the destinies of a free Bulgaria. In no department has such progress been made in the Principality as in that of public education. Though accurate statistics are still wanting, the following data may convey a notion of the activity which has been displayed in this field. According to a report published by Dr. Yiręczek, the eminent Bulgarian historian, in the *Osveta*, there are at the present moment no less than 1,088 elementary schools in the Principality, attended

by 56,854 children of both sexes who receive instruction at the hands of 1,378 teachers. These schools are maintained by the community, and cost annually 735,533 francs, besides rations in kind of 71,332 okes ($2\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.) of corn. But the Government contributes largely to the erection of the schools, and appoints inspectors to superintend their efficiency. Nothing struck me more forcibly during my visit to Bulgaria than the neatness of the village schools, and the intelligent earnestness of the schoolmasters. The days are past indeed when Greek bishops could persuade their flocks that the only schools which could bring a blessing on the community were churches raised by voluntary contributions, and that the only education which they required was that given from the pulpit. The Government, on the other hand, bears the whole cost of secondary education, which is represented by four grammar schools at Varna, Gabrova, Lom-Palanka, and Küstendil; three schools on the model of the German *Bürger-schulen* at Dubnitsa, Silistria, and Tzaribrot; and two girls' schools at Sofia and Tirnova. Two more grammar schools will be opened next year at Shumla and Vratza. Besides these there is a classical gymnasium at Sofia, and at Lescovatz a seminary for the education of candidates for the priesthood.

The latter establishment deserves more than a cursory notice, as it marks a complete departure from the system of education to which students for holy orders have hitherto been condemned in orthodox countries. The liberal scheme of studies which are pursued there leaves far behind it even the Greek seminary of the Nesos at Yanina. My attention was especially directed to it while I was at Tirnova by Bishop Clement, one of the most able and estimable of Bulgarian prelates, and who, as President of the second Conservative Cabinet, powerfully contributed to its organisation. The seminary is about an hour's drive from Tirnova, through some of the most picturesque scenery in Bulgaria. The road rises in steep zigzags over the left cliffs of the valley of the Yantra; the ancient capital of Bulgaria lies beneath one, scattered in picturesque confusion up and down the precipitous banks of the winding river, out of whose bed, shaped almost like the figure 8, rise the two peninsular rocks upon which once stood the palace of the Bulgarian Czars, and the fortress which was the prison of the unfortunate Emperor Baldwin; while beyond the wooded gorge from which the Yantra issues, chain upon chain of hills lead the eye towards the faint outline of the distant main-ridge of the Balkans. From the top of the cliff a broad fertile plateau reaches across to the wooded promontory upon which stands the seminary of Lescovatz, overlooking the swelling plains of Eastern Bulgaria far away towards the hills of Shumla. The building is solid, spacious, and conveniently laid out, and the general appearance of its arrangements is one of cleanliness and frugal comfort. The course of studies pursued is not restricted to the special branch

for which the students are intended, and this is its chief peculiarity and merit. The preparatory course indeed scarcely differs from that followed at ordinary grammar schools. Passing over the elementary classes, the curriculum of the second class comprises besides the study of Bulgarian and Slavonic, that of Russian and of French, general history, geography, algebra, geometry and the usual lessons in divinity. Only in the first class is a special study introduced, that of ecclesiastical history. Nor is it till the student has passed out of the first class, *i.e.* till he is probably seventeen or eighteen years of age, that he is definitely admitted to enter himself as a candidate for holy orders. His special course of studies, during which other subjects are not neglected, lasts over another term of four years. When he enters the priesthood, he will therefore, it may be hoped, have not only the training which will make him a good priest, but also the general education which will make him a useful and enlightened citizen. The seminary is still too young for any judgment to be formed upon results. But from the spirit in which it is conducted, it may be confidently anticipated that success will attend upon this new attempt to instil some fresh and healthy blood into the sluggish veins of the Orthodox priesthood.

Another department in which astonishing progress has been made during the past two years is that of public works. Means of communication have been so rapidly multiplied since the days when the few strategic roads bequeathed by Midhat Pasha to the Vilayet of the Danube were the wonderment of Bulgaria, that there is now scarcely an important village in the Principality to which the traveller may not drive in the light victoria which has become acclimatised in the country under the curious misnomer of *Pæton*. More than four hundred kilometres of new roads have been thrown open for wheel traffic since the beginning of 1879, and the credit allowed in this year's budget for the department of Public Works will enable that figure to be nearly doubled. I have already alluded to the schools which have been built at the cost of the State. To these must be added a large number of hospitals, barracks, and government buildings of all descriptions.

The development of public prosperity, to which the elasticity of the revenue bears witness, may be further illustrated by the growth of trade and commerce, as shown by the Customs' receipts of the Principality. Let us take the last term for which returns have been issued, *viz.* : March 1—June 1, 1881, and compare it with the corresponding period in 1880. The following figures tell their own tale :—

March, 1880	410,751 francs.
„ 1881	454,234 „
April, 1880	324,990 „
„ 1881	403,422 „
May, 1880	335,688 „
„ 1881	513,520 „

During the three months of March, April, and May, 1880, the import and export duties levied by the Bulgarian Customs yielded 1,062,259 francs. During the same three months in 1881 they rose to 1,372,176 francs, an excess in round figures of 310,000 francs. The total value of the exports exceeded the total value of the imports by nearly 4,000,000 francs.

One of the most painful questions with which the Liberal Government had to deal, was that of the treatment of the Mussulman population—the one black spot on the latest page of Bulgarian history. I had several opportunities of conversing freely with some of the leading Mussulmans of the Principality, and notably with the Mufti of Tirnova, a man of high character and personal courage, and who had shown the latter during the war by remaining at his post as a protest against the general exodus of his co-religionists, and for his pains had his house burnt down over his head by a Bulgarian mob. Contrary, I must confess, to my expectations, they generally bore witness to the improvement which had taken place in the condition of the Turkish population since the advent of the Liberals to power. Although they still had much to complain of, they had at least been able to obtain a certain measure of justice, from which it had hitherto appeared to them that they were to be for ever debarred. Efforts had been made to procure an amicable settlement in cases where Bulgarians had taken possession of houses and land belonging to absent refugees and refused to give them up to their rightful owners when they returned to claim their own. Active persecution had almost entirely ceased. Turkish *knetts*, or mayors, had been substituted for Bulgarians in some of the districts where the Turkish element preponderated. They had begun in fact to feel that the rights to which they were entitled by the Constitution were something more than a mere dead letter. As a natural consequence, the hitherto constant flow of emigration had been arrested, and many of those who had fled were returning to their homes. It may be that this salutary change in the disposition of the Government was not due merely to considerations of abstract justice. The impolicy of driving away a valuable agricultural population, and the advisability of strengthening the anti-Russian element in the Principality may have entered into its calculations. But these considerations, if they existed, only served to strengthen a resolve which was good in itself and which has operated for good.¹

Such are a few of the tangible results obtained during two short

(1) I have purposely abstained from referring to the organization of the army, as the chief credit for the high standard of efficiency and discipline to which the young Bulgarian troops have attained properly belongs to the Russian officers under whose command they have been placed. But, without wishing to detract from the value of the services they have rendered, it should be remembered that it is Bulgaria herself who has furnished both the means and materials, without which the Russian officers might have laboured in vain.

years under the auspices of a constitution which, we are told to believe, has disorganized Bulgaria! Where are we to look for the signs of this disorganization? In the buoyancy of the public revenue? In the growth of trade and commerce? In the advancement of public education? In the energy with which public works are being prosecuted and multiplied? In the improved condition of the Turkish population? Or in that general development of the moral and material welfare of the country which cannot escape the notice of the most superficial observer who compares the Bulgaria of to-day with the Bulgaria of yesterday?

"But at least Bulgaria was discredited abroad." With this charge it is more difficult to deal. Foreign opinion, however, can seldom be accepted as a trustworthy criterion of national institutions, and least of all can it be trusted in regard to a country like Bulgaria, which has not yet had time to live down the bitter hostility that only yesterday resented as a crime the very fact of its existing, and which is still surrounded by jealous and hungry neighbours. The two countries in which the Bulgarian Constitution has been most fiercely denounced are Austria and Russia. The value of these attacks is not enhanced by the knowledge that both in Austria and Russia the Constitution was condemned before it was even put on its trial, though the Emperor Alexander II. was too equitable to endorse its condemnation. It was evident that democratic institutions were not likely to find favour in the eyes of the Russian official world. The open hostility which it at last encountered in that quarter was not provoked, but only intensified by the determination of the Liberal Cabinet to emancipate itself entirely from Russian tutelage. This determination again was due to the conviction, which events have only too quickly justified, that so long as the Bulgarian army was in the hands of Russian officers, Bulgaria would never be secure against a *coup d'état*. Apart, however, from this consideration, there were motives of economy which equally recommended the expediency of dispensing with the costly services of Russian officers and officials. Every year brings back to Bulgaria a fresh contingent of young citizens who have fitted themselves for civil or for military employment by a course of studies abroad, and who are capable of replacing with advantage a body of foreigners who have no sympathy with nor interest in the country which they serve. The Prince, however, declined to listen to the recommendations of his Cabinet. His motives are now obvious, but they reflect discredit upon no one except himself. Austria had from the beginning shown her antipathy to the new order of things in Bulgaria by advising the Prince not to swear allegiance to the Constitution under which he had been elected. After this first proof of friendliness she still expected the Bulgarians to subordinate their interests to hers in two questions of vital importance to the Principality, that of the navigation of the Danube and of

the Oriental railways. With regard to the former, the policy of the Bulgarian Government was nearly identical with that of Roumania. Both were ready to recognise Austria's right to exercise a large control over the navigation of the Danube, but both were unwilling to concede her claim to be regarded as the sole Danubian Power. In the railway question, Bulgarian "obstructiveness," as it was termed at Vienna, was principally directed against a scheme which would have handed over the railways of the Principality to the tender mercies of Baron Hirsch. Those who are acquainted with the more or less secret history of the railways of European Turkey will scarcely consider any amount of "obstructiveness" unjustifiable which might avert such a consummation. It may be regretted that in dealing with these delicate questions some of the members of the Liberal Government did not display, either in their attitude towards the Prince or in their relations with the foreign representatives, the tact and prudence which their position required. But, after, all the chief blame which attaches to them is that they forgot the danger of showing one's cards when the last trumps are in the adversaries' hands. While we are on the chapter of foreign opinion, it may be noticed that the Roumanian Government, which is certainly not the worst placed to form an opinion upon Bulgarian affairs, was the only one which declined to send its representative to Sistova, and took no part in the congratulations which the other "civilised" Powers offered to the Prince on the occasion of the interment of the Constitution.

Upon the means which were employed to obtain the return of a servile Assembly to ratify the decisions of the Prince, it is, I think, unnecessary to dilate. Public opinion in England has been sufficiently enlightened as to the true character of the electoral campaign. The educated classes were terrorised by Russian Commissioners and military tribunals, and finally kept away by brute force from the polling booths,¹ while the votes of an ignorant

(1) Conclusive evidence was furnished to me on this point while I was at Sofia, in the shape of the text of three telegrams, addressed by the Russian Special Commissioner at Nicopoli to General Ernroth, and his Excellency's telegraphic answers thereto. Nicopoli is one of the staunchest Liberal centres in Bulgaria. On the morning of June 27, the day fixed for the first polling, the Commissioner telegraphed to headquarters his apprehension that the elections would be "bad," as a large number of Liberal electors had already gathered in front of the polling-booths. To this telegram General Ernroth replied by an order to call out the troops and take all necessary precautions. The Liberal electors seem, however, to have insisted with unbecoming pertinacity on exercising their rights, for a couple of hours later the Commissioner telegraphs again that no ordinary precautions would suffice to prevent the return of the Liberal candidates, and asks for further instructions. This appeal elicits an order to fix bayonets and load ball cartridges. Even this threat did not intimidate the voters, who are again reported to General Ernroth as gathering in overwhelming numbers and attempting to force their way to the ballot-boxes. General Ernroth is equal to the emergency, for he wires back one single word, "Fire!" The Commissioner, however, was not a man of blood and iron. He contented himself with ordering the soldiers to charge with the bayonet. A

peasantry were secured by vague threats of handing them back to the Turk, and by fair promises of exemption from taxation and military service. To this electoral programme, made up in equal parts of violence and of fraud, M. Hitrovo, the Russian Consul-General, did not hesitate to lend the whole weight of the influence, legitimate or other, of which Russia still disposes in the Principality. With such means and such support the Prince's victory was inevitable. After two years of scheming and of plotting he had reached the goal. He had rid himself of an irksome Constitution, and cleverly vaulted into the saddle of autocracy.

What the future of Bulgaria will be under the new *régime* it may yet be thought too early to forecast; but if any conclusion can be drawn from the results with which its inauguration has already been attended, the day would seem to be not far distant when the people of Bulgaria will cast back into the Prince's teeth the very words of his own proclamation—disorganization at home and discredit abroad. Three months and more have now elapsed since Prince Alexander assumed the responsibility of absolute power. To what condition has he brought in that short space of time the country of which he claimed to be the special providence? He has ostranged every section of the population, the administrations which he has placed in subjection to foreigners, the army which he has recklessly used for the most unworthy purposes, the educated classes whom he has terrorised, the peasantry whom he has duped by false promises. He has saddled the finances of the Principality with the costs of a huge electoral fraud. He has arrested the work of public education by driving into exile whole bodies of teachers. He has placed one-third of the country under martial law, and handed over the rest to the arbitrary rule of special Commissioners armed with unlimited powers. The iron hand of Russian officers may, for a time, maintain discipline in the army; exceptional measures may coerce the country into outward submission; the taxes may be wrung by force out of a deluded peasantry in spite of electoral pledges; the administration may be stocked with foreigners just as the new Cabinet already is; the support of powerful neighbours may be purchased by the sacrifice of every national interest. But who can doubt what will be the ultimate fate of a *régime* whose existence is doomed from its very origin to be one continual struggle against the conscience, the intelligence, and the interests of the country?

M. VALENTINE CHIROL.

CONSTANTINOPLE, August 9.

few people were wounded, a number arrested, and the electors were dispersed without having succeeded in registering sufficient votes to get their candidates duly elected. Another *tour de scrutin* was therefore necessary, and it should have taken place on the following Sunday. But before that date a princely Ukase was issued, disfranchising the town of Nicopoli on account of the disturbances which had taken place there on the 27th of June! *Ab uno disce omnia.*

NAPOLEON THE IDOL.

FROM THE FRENCH OF BARBIER.

QUICK, Foreman, quick, wood-coal and pit-coal throw,
Tin, copper, iron, toss them there—
With huge arm fiercely raking to and fro,
Like an old Vulcan, feed the flare.

A mighty meal to the vast furnace bring,
For if those teeth are meant to bite,
And chew the ores you to his gullet fling,
That palate roof must flame with light.

'Tis well—the mad fires burst in wrath at large,
Blood-red and pitiless they wake :
Whilst rolling down they sound their battle charge,
Out-flanked and clubbed the metals break—

With one delirious bound and yell and throe
Copper on tin, on iron rolls
Tin fused, all twists, all twines, as far below
In Hell deep-vaulted three damned souls.

At length the work is done—the lights have died,
The white heat fades to ashen grey—
Whilst yet the mass boils hard, fling, Foreman, wide
Thy gates, and give the proud his way.

Oh ! rushing river sweep along thy bed,
With one dart forth, one impulse pour
Thyself, as cataracts flash from over-head,
As flames from a volcano roar.

The earth's breast gapes to clasp your lava wave,
Dash down, one raging mass, amain,
Into that mould of steel, dash down a slave,
And straight an emperor rise again.

Napoleon yet—once more that Titan's frame ;
Ah ! what a price he made us pay,
The soldier grim, in blood and tears and shame,
For certain paltry sprigs of bay.

Sad—sad for France—the tortured and down-flung,
 When tottering on its lofty base,
 Like some poor thief, his earlier statue hung
 On cruel cords in empty space.

And, when by ceaseless efforts overthrown,
 Head-first that proud and king-like mass
 Tumbled at speed, then on the frozen stone
 Rolled, rattling down its corpse of brass,

The Hun of skin that stinks, the stupid Hun,
 His eyes with drunken anger red,
 Before all France, where filthiest gutters run,
 Dragged through the dirt our Emperor's head.

On all who keep a heart their breasts within,
 Weighs like a sense of guilt that day,
 It is a brand on each French brow, burnt in,
 Which nought but Death can cleanse away.

I saw beneath our marbles shadowing,
 The invader crowd his heavy wains,
 And strip our trees, as food their bark to fling,
 For horses from his Scythian plains.

I saw the Northman stern of aspect beat
 Our blackened flesh, and never spare,
 Till the blood sprung ; they came our bread to eat,
 And fill their foul lungs with our air.

Young Frenchmen ! lovely in their wantonness,
 I saw our shameless mates in line
 Upon the Cossack's gaze their bosoms press,
 And drink his hot smell in like wine.

Well, through those days of pain, of evil fate,
 Of nameless horrors undergone,
 There was but one on whom I flung my hate,
 Accursed be thou—Napoleon.

Oh, straight-haired Corsican, was not France fair
 'Neath those grand suns of Messidor ?
 A dauntless and untameable blood-mare,
 Nor steel bit, nor gold reins she wore.

A courser wild, her rough flanks all a-glow
With gore from kings that reeked, plunged she;
Her proud feet sharply smote the earth below,
That earth then, for the first time, free.

No hand had yet bent down that stately crest,
To stain her beauty, or disturb,
On her broad loins no saddle had been prest,
Nor knew she yet a stranger's curb.

Her bright coat gleamed, as wandering like the wind,
With keen eye, and limbs never still,
Poised on firm hocks, she terrified mankind,
With her defiant neighings shrill.

You came and saw her beautiful and young,
With quarters rippling as she stept,
Grasping her mane, a Centaur bold and strong,
High-booted on her back you leapt.

Then as she loved the sound of war, the force
Of powder, and the drum's fierce roll,
All earth you gave her for her Beacon-course,
And battles to delight her soul.

Then no more peace, no hope from sleep or night,
Still new skies, motion and unrest,
She crushed like sand men's bodies in her flight,
With blood-gouts splashing round her breast.

Thus fifteen years her hard foot smiting fast,
Hurled generations to the ground,
Thus fifteen years at reeking speed she past
O'er prostrate millions strewed around.

Till wearied of her ceaseless gallop there,
Of roads to a goal never brought,
Of trampling worlds, and scattering on the air
Like dust, the lives of men for nought,

With spent breath tottering by in weak despair,
At every stride about to fall,
She prayed the Corsican who rode, to spare—
You, cut-throat, listened not at all.

Hard and more hard your sinewy thighs pressed home,
 To quench the low moans from beneath,
 You wrenched the curb about her mouth all foam,
 And broke in reckless wrath her teeth.

She rose once more for her last battle-plain,
 But with no strength the bit to hold,
 Then on a bed of grape she dropped again,
 And crushed you as in death she rolled.

From that dread fall, as by a second birth,
 Like the bright eagle rising high,
 You mount again to lord it over earth,
 And float re-plumed along the sky.

No more that thief of crowns—Napoleon,
 That brigand, shameless, false, and coarse,
 Who pressed the choking cushions of his throne
 On Freedom's throat, without remorse.

No more that galley-slave who died despairing
 On his black rock, and dragged his heel,
 The thought of France like felon's bullet wearing
 Beneath the stranger's scourge of steel.

Not so—no stain upon the Emperor stays,
 Thanks to each flatterer's utterance, thanks
 To lying poets belching forth his praise,
 'Mid Cæsar gods, a god he ranks.

His presence lights each wall once more,
 His name in every public street
 Sounds, as of old through the grim battle's roar
 It sounded from the drums that beat.

Whilst from each height, where swarms the populace,
 Drops Paris, like a pilgrim old,
 And day by day, at the tall column's base,
 Bows in the dust her forehead bold.

There grasping loads of bay, born but to die,
 And tossing flower-floods ever new
 To that bronze, where can rest no mother's eye,
 Since under mothers' tears it grew,

To fife and clarion, drunk with maniac glee,
Around the great Napoleon—France
Keeps up, though drest in work-day garb she be,
The riot of her reckless dance.

Move on then—oh, tame shepherds of mankind,
Kings of meek spirit—go your way !
Wise—but with foreheads of that vulgar kind,
Which throws not back Fame's dazzling ray.

By you men's fetters are struck off in vain,
In vain, because you lead and save ;
Your flocks unvext without or toil or pain,
Reach their long rest within the grave.

Soon as your guiding stars have ceased to be,
Whilst their last light dies down apace,
Each failing name, along Time's boundless sea,
Scarce marks its momentary trace.

Move on—move on—for you no statues rise,
Your work the Future knoweth not,
The only Lord of living memories,
Is he who kills with sword, or shot.

Man worships him, by whom moist fields are hid
Beneath a heap of putrid bones,
He loves the builder of the pyramid,
Who breaks all backs to move his stones.

The people is a tap-room wench, who likes
To quaff the harsh new wine, and yearns
To find a lover with a fist that strikes,
An iron frame, an eye that burns.

She, couched on straw in her foul garret's height,
Can love none but the Rough, whose way
Is to beat hard, and maul her all the night—
The livelong night—till dawns the day.

FRANCIS HASTINGS DOYLE.

SOUTH AFRICA: AN UNSPOKEN SPEECH.¹

It now becomes my duty to explain the policy which her Majesty's Government has adopted in this very difficult matter, and to reply to the main objections which have been urged against it, both here and elsewhere. In order to do this it is necessary to ask how we come to be ruling some 500,000 square miles in Southern Africa. That huge territory, equal to four or five times the area of the British Isles, was not acquired in consequence of any deliberate scheme of national policy; there was no popular demand for its acquisition, and no statesman counselled it. We have come into possession of our dominions in that part of the world by a series of historical accidents, which began as late as the days of the fathers of most of us,² and within the memory of a good many people who are still living, when, in 1806, Governor Janssens capitulated to Sir David Baird.

If the men of that day could have foreseen the future, there is, I suppose, very little doubt that they would have been satisfied with retaining for the British Crown, Cape Town and Simon's Bay, with a moderate piece of territory in their neighbourhood, and would have created all north of their frontier line into a Dutch Free State, which would have been left to pursue what policy it pleased, to have been content with its then very narrow limits, or to have gone forward, conquering and civilising in a rude and imperfect way, till it got to regions in which white men could not permanently establish themselves.

Unhappily, however, the men of the early days of this century no more possessed the gift of prophecy than do their descendants. They took over the Dutch settlements just as they were, "with their engagements;" and these engagements have led us on, and on, and on, till we find ourselves masters of a gigantic country, which brings us no direct profit, much direct loss, not any very large amount of indirect profit, and few, indeed, of the things which men or nations sigh for, except the bare name of Empire, in return for infinite anxieties and much responsibility.

We have been brought to this mainly by the action, reaction, and interaction of two forces. First, the enterprise and vigour of the Dutch and the English, both very strong races, which have desired to press always forward to the north, in search of new fields of gain

(1) Prepared in the early summer for the debate on the Transvaal, which, frequently postponed, did not take place till I had left Parliament.—M. E. GRANT DUFF.

(2) My own father fought in the action which preceded the capitulation.

or comfort. Secondly, by the humanitarian impulses amongst our own people, which have become so very strong during the period which has elapsed since the taking of the Cape, and which have compelled Government after Government to follow the Dutch and English adventurers with law and administration, in order that they might not exterminate or enslave the natives, in accordance with their natural instincts or those maxims of polity which the South African Dutchman has for ages founded upon the history of the Old Testament. The outcome of these two forces, acting upon successive English administrations, brought about the state of things in South Africa which we found when we came into office a year ago, and which I think I can sum up in a very few sentences.

We found the vast territory to which I have alluded peopled by two races, natives and white men. We found that the natives, instead of showing any tendency, as they have done in other parts of the world—in America, in Australia, in New Zealand, for example—to disappear before the white man, were, on the contrary, sure not only to stand their ground in point of numbers, but to increase the disproportion between their numbers and those of the white race. We found that white race divided into two great sections, the English and the Dutch. Of these, the Dutch outnumbered the English by about two to one; and although the English were the more enterprising, the spirit of the Dutch had been raised by various causes, and not least by the very considerable success which had attended the experiment of the concession of perfect independence to the Orange Free State, something less than a generation ago. The first conclusion which we drew from the examination of the state of affairs in South Africa, as it was in the spring of 1880, was, that the thing before all others necessary for South Africa, in the presence of the constant increase of numbers amongst the natives, was a perfectly good understanding between the two sections of the white race.

The next thing which we observed was, that a project, which had been set on foot by our predecessors for the confederation of the whole of South Africa, was under consideration in the colonies concerned. We ardently desired that this confederation *should*, though I cannot say we much believed that it *would* come about, for it was quite clear that until some confederation, or union in one form or another, of the South African colonies could be brought into existence, there would be constant trouble of all kinds, and the mother country would never be rid of the thankless task of checking here, interfering there, and paying every few years millions and millions of money for wars in which she had only a constructive and technical interest. When we came into office a decisive vote upon this subject of confederation was just about to be taken in the Cape Parliament, and it was perfectly obvious that, as regards the southern part of our

South African dominions, the one all-important duty was to watch and wait until we saw what the result of the approaching vote would be, for on that vote must depend the policy of the mother country.

In the northern part of our South African dominions we found, when we came into office, that great and violent changes had been taking place. A war of considerable magnitude had been waged upon the Natal frontier with a tribe which, when we went out of office in 1874, had been on perfectly good terms with us. The whole of the Transvaal, which we left an independent State in 1874, had been annexed, and a war of less magnitude, but still of some importance, had been carried on by her Majesty's troops against the native chief Secocoeni.

I have said nothing of the wars that had been going forward in the Cape Colony, but, as we all know, there had been wars, and the general result of the whole of our survey of the 500,000 square miles of British territory in South Africa was that everywhere there had been confusion, everywhere trouble, and that the one great thing that was wanted for South Africa was rest. Our desire accordingly was to interfere as little as we could, to continue working in the same spirit as that in which Sir Michael Hicks Beach had worked, as distinguished from the perfectly well-intentioned, but, as I must be permitted to think, most unfortunate spirit which animated his immediate predecessor, Lord Carnarvon. We wished, in fact, to continue and to enforce a sedative policy, while we utterly repudiated the irritant or stimulant policy, which, carried into effect under the orders of Lord Carnarvon, is mainly associated in the public mind with the names of Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Theophilus Shepstone.

Possessed by this desire not to introduce any new element of confusion into South Africa, we firmly resisted the pressure of some of our friends instantly to recall Sir Bartle Frere, with the certain result of destroying what little chance there was of a vote in the Cape Parliament favourable to confederation; we determined not to annul the annexation of the Transvaal; we did not favour the idea entertained by some that a roving Commission should be sent out to look into all South African questions; and we did not think it necessary to cancel the mandates which had been given by our predecessors to Sir Owen Lanyon to govern the Transvaal, to Sir George Colley to govern Natal, to look after the Zulu settlement, and to supervise the doings of Sir Owen Lanyon at Pretoria.

Our endeavour for the first few weeks that we were in office, so far as South Africa was concerned, was to introduce no change whatsoever. We made it clear to the Cape and to Natal that, although confederation was no project of ours, we should only be too delighted to see it come about, and we told the Transvaal that

although the annexation could not be annulled, we should embrace the very first occasion to give it absolute self-government as far as the white inhabitants were concerned, provided only it would agree to leave us what amounted to little more than a control of its foreign relations and native policy.

Of course hon. members opposite cannot blame us for this decision, but some members on our own side who voted with the member for Liskeard, have a right to do so, and in order to have the whole case clearly before the House, I may explain in a few sentences why we did not annul the annexation. In the first place, all the evidence which we found at the Colonial Office made in favour of the theory that the country was gradually settling down. Sir Garnet Wolseley, who had at one time entertained misgivings, not only desired to come away, which he, a brilliant and faithful soldier, certainly would not have done if he had believed that there would be any work for the soldier, but wrote in the most positive manner in favour of the view that all was going well. On March 2nd, 1880, he said :—

“As a consequence of the conviction thus established of the unyielding resolution of the British Government there is, I believe, a growing desire, certainly amongst the more intelligent, and probably amongst the majority of the malcontents, for the conclusion of the agitation which is now beginning to appear to them as a fruitless and dangerous trouble.”

On March 9th he said :—

“When all classes are convinced of the irrevocability of the annexation, of which I have lost no opportunity of assuring them, and come also to understand that it is our wish not only to rule justly, but to conciliate the people in every way compatible with the due maintenance of our authority, disaffection and agitation will, I believe, most surely die out.”

On April 10th he gave his final impression of the prospects of the country as follows :—

“Reports from all quarters of the Transvaal sustain the opinion that the people being thoroughly weary of the uncertainty and the troubles attendant upon opposition to the Government, and seeing no hope of any successful issue from the dangerous measures in which they have been induced to place confidence, have determined to renounce all further disturbing action, and to return to the peaceful cares of their rural life, which is already beginning to suffer from the continuance of political irritation.”

Sir Owen Lanyon took precisely the same line. He did not give us the slightest hint that he was uneasy.

Not only did the persons who were responsible for keeping the Home Government informed take this view in their correspondence with the Colonial Office, but persons speaking in the heart of the country, at Pretoria, did the same. I will quote a passage, which curiously illustrates this, from a speech which was delivered by Mr.

Hudson, the Colonial Secretary at Pretoria, soon after we came into office, and which, although it was not before us in so many words at the moment it was decided to retain the territory, a remark which I think applies to some of the other observations I have quoted, well reflects the tone that was taken by all the officials in the Transvaal in the spring of last year, and illustrates the "climate of opinion" amidst which we found ourselves.

Mr. Hudson spoke as follows :—

"Take the Transvaal, it certainly does desire to preserve its autonomy, and though it may not be ripe as yet for the introduction of responsible or party government, it is fast emerging from its past political and financial difficulties, and deriving a revenue mainly from direct and internal taxation, more than sufficient to meet its expenditure. Its known illimitable wealth, now buried and requiring only to be unearthed, and its glorious position as the highway to Central Africa, are attracting to it public attention both here and abroad, and hence it is, with a conviction of its great future, that the people of the Transvaal would be loth to part with self-government under a provincial legislature. It requires only the railway from Delagoa Bay—for the interest and maintenance of which a select committee of its Legislature has produced evidence to show its ability to pay—to place this province in the position of early undertaking its self-government, and to make it form an important factor, under confederation, in assisting to relieve the Imperial Government from future responsibilities, and in consolidating British power in South Africa to the advantage of its inhabitants."

But this was not merely the tone of the officials. Here is an extract from a speech made in the same debate by a non-official member, anything but inclined to give an indiscriminating support to Sir Owen Lanyon's administration, which, in its turn, illustrates the view that was generally taken by the non-official portion of the British population.

On the 7th of June, speaking in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. White said :—

"There is still a condition alleged by some to the carrying out of this confederation, and that is the present state of this country; but I think, Sir, that the statements made relative to the condition of the Transvaal are not true statements of that condition. I am sure that the House will agree with me when I say that the present state of the Transvaal is perhaps the most tranquil state that it has enjoyed since the annexation. It is true there are a few agitators who are stumping the country, and there are a few newspapers which advocate the views of these agitators, but I state here without fear of contradiction that the thinking portion of the inhabitants of this State are content with their present condition."

Of course I am aware that the non-official members were not elected representatives, but that is not my point. I wish to show that in the heart of the Transvaal people who, like this Mr. White, were by no means inclined *jurare in verba* of the Government, as he showed by directly opposing it in the autumn, took the view that all was well.

These were very strong and positive testimonies to set against the Boer petitions, which we were assured were merely the work of a limited number of agitators, and by no means represented the real feeling even of the Boer, much less of the native or British, population. Then it was perfectly evident that if we determined to retire from the country there would be the greatest difficulty in arriving at a *modus vivendi* between the Boers and the English settlers who had bought property in the Transvaal, and there would also be the greatest difficulty in arranging for the due protection of the rights of the natives. We see what these difficulties are, now, when all men who have eyes perceive that there is no alternative between doing what we are doing, and keeping, at the expense of the British taxpayer for years to come, a large body of men in the Transvaal to crush down insurrection by force. But how much greater would they have been, then, when hardly any one believed that such difficulties would arise, when we had not a scrap of authoritative evidence to refer to, or to lay before Parliament, in favour of the belief that the country was not settling down, and when we had nothing like the force which we have now in South Africa? Thus far our policy was one of simply accepting accomplished facts. We had nothing to do with the annexation, and nothing that we found when the records of the Colonial Office were opened to us gave us the slightest reason to believe that that annexation had been prudent, but everything led us to think that it was just one of those cases in which you must make the best of a bad bargain. *Fieri non debuit*, we said at the time and in the way it was done, *factum valet*.

To sum up. On one side was our conviction that the act of Lord Carnarvon had been premature and impolitic; on the other the belief that South Africa had suffered much in the past from abrupt changes of policy; that our retirement from the Transvaal would mean the certain overthrow of all immediate hopes of confederation, endless embarrassing questions, a possible civil war between the Boer and British sympathisers, the reconstituting a government worse than the bad government which Sir Theophilus Shepstone overthrew, and the possibility of having to annex over again in a very few years. Was it wonderful that under those circumstances we remembered the somewhat paradoxical maxim, which was constantly in the mouth of one of the greatest of British administrators when he wished to deprecate sudden changes of policy, "Any plan is a good plan if you only stick to it?"

The first incident which obliged us to take any action that would not have been taken by Sir Michael Hicks Beach and his colleagues, was the withdrawal by the Cape Ministry of their proposals for a confederation. As soon as that event occurred, the whole reason for keeping Sir Bartle Frere at the Cape

seemed to us at an end, and we directed him to return to this country.

The overthrow of the hopes of confederation required us to repeat, with reference alike to Natal and the Transvaal, our assurances that nothing was further from our desire than to retain any more control over their affairs than circumstances made absolutely necessary, so that there should be no pretence for saying, either in the one country or the other, that the failure of the proposals for confederation was a death-blow to their hopes.

This was the situation when Parliament rose, in the beginning of September last year, as explained in the statements that were then made from the Treasury bench on behalf of the Government. By this time Sir George Colley had been for some months in South Africa, and was in a position to advise us as to what ought to be done. Did he take a different view from his predecessor, Sir Garnet Wolseley? On the contrary, he confirmed Sir Garnet's views in every particular. He not only did that in word, but he did it in deed, by assuring us that we might, with perfect safety, withdraw some troops from the Transvaal. But perhaps this withdrawal was an act which would not have been done by the previous Government. Let us see how that matter stands. Not only was Sir George Colley their choice, not ours, but when the present Government came into power it found that its predecessors had provided for the retention of the King's Dragoon Guards in the Transvaal for six months only. It was clear, then, that their intention was to withdraw that regiment. Before, however, we acted on their resolution, we consulted both Sir Garnet Wolseley and Sir George Colley, and both thought it might with propriety be withdrawn. It was accordingly sent to India in the end of September.

We further consulted Sir George Colley with reference to the withdrawal of a regiment of infantry, which was approved by Sir Garnet Wolseley. Sir George Colley deferred giving an opinion till he had visited the Transvaal; but eventually, after visiting it, and after consulting with Sir Owen Lanyon, approved of the 58th being taken away, not only from the Transvaal, but altogether from South Africa. This, however, was not done. It was retained in Natal, on the southern frontier of which things were somewhat uneasy in the autumn.

Well, but if we were to withdraw troops from the Transvaal, should we not have tried to conciliate the Boers?

My reply is that we did so, and mainly in two ways.

First. Our representatives reiterated the assurances that if the Boer malcontent section would only frankly accept the sovereignty of the Queen, and leave us some such control over their dealings with the natives as would have been provided in South Africa itself,

if a Confederation had come into existence, they should have the most complete control of their own affairs, after having been picked by the British Government out of the gulf of bankruptcy. How thoroughly this was understood by some of the foremost men in the Transvaal, not of British blood, may be gathered from extracts which I read to the House last January, and with which I need not again trouble hon. members.

Secondly. We did all we could to procure the ratification of the Lourenço Marques Treaty by the Portuguese Government. That treaty, a necessary preliminary to the construction of a railway to Delagoa Bay, was the thing for which all sound-headed and intelligent men in the Transvaal most cared, and it was a thing which, without British assistance, was quite out of the question.

Meantime the reports continued good. Both Sir Owen Lanyon and Sir George Colley wrote in the most hopeful way, and there was nothing of importance to set against this, in the way of warning from other parts of South Africa. Almost every one, official and non-official, in the Cape and Natal, thought, as Sir George Colley and Sir Owen Lanyon thought, that the acquiescence of the malcontent Boers was a mere question of time.

The same sort of news came through the whole of the autumn. Sir Owen Lanyon wrote, after a long journey through the country, that all along his route the white population appeared more or less satisfied and contented with the present *régime*. Sir George Colley, who also travelled extensively in the country during the autumn, in addressing the Natal Council, on the 21st of October, soon after his return, spoke as follows :—

“In the Transvaal the agitation, which has long been fanned by a party inimical to the British Government, appears to be subsiding. The country is tranquil, law and order are everywhere maintained, taxes yielding a large revenue have been regularly paid by whites and natives alike, and we may reasonably hope that the prosperity which the Transvaal now enjoys, under a firm and settled Government, will be permanent and increasing, and will beneficially affect this colony also.”

In the middle of November some resistance was made at Potchefstroom to the sale of a waggon for non-payment of taxes. This resistance was reported by Sir Owen Lanyon, but he did not attach any serious importance to the affair. He thought, however, that that and similar acts could not be allowed to pass without being punished, and he also directed the prosecution of a newspaper called the *Volkstem*, for seditious writing; while quite at the end of November he wrote to the Secretary of State that he had asked Sir George Colley to allow the 58th to return to the Transvaal, before the time fixed for a mass meeting of the Boers in January. On the 4th December Sir George Colley telegraphed to us that he was sending

half a battalion to the Transvaal at Sir Owen Lanyon's request, "the attitude of the Boers requiring increased force at Pretoria."

The news of the sending up of this trifling force was the first hint of there being any sort of uneasiness in the mind either of Sir George Colley or Sir Owen Lanyon which reached the Secretary of State, until on the 19th December Sir George Colley telegraphed that Heidelberg had been seized.

Well, now, what was the first impression which that news produced upon the Government? It was the impression that this proceeding was the act of a small, though angry, minority. All our agents had warned us that there was such a minority. None of our agents, and none even of the recognised organs of non-official opinion in South Africa, had led us to believe that the Boers, as a body, would ever do more than pass resolutions, more or less sincere, in mass meetings. We did then the only thing that we or any other Government could have done; we determined to put down the malcontent minority by force, in the interest of the well-affected majority, and we took measures accordingly to reinforce Sir George Colley, and to support him in every possible way.

Then came an incident which has been a good deal commented upon. A deputation of Cape colonists waited upon the acting administrator, Sir George Strahan, and suggested that a Commissioner should be sent to the Transvaal to make terms with the insurgents. That proposal was handed on to the Government, and by it was declined, with the remark that the moment was not an opportune one for taking such a step. What other answer could have been given? Were we, while all our information led us to suppose that we had to do merely with a malcontent minority, to give way to that malcontent minority? No, we had no doubt that our first duty was to bring such a force into South Africa as to be sufficient amply to vindicate the Queen's authority, and the announcement that we should do so was made in the Queen's Speech, and repeated in various forms upon other occasions.

Soon, however, the conviction was brought home to our minds, and not to our minds only, but to the minds of the whole country, that we had to do with a far more serious movement of opinion than we had expected to encounter; that it was not merely a malcontent minority with which we had to contend in the Transvaal, but a malcontent majority, and that the feeling of that malcontent majority was shared to a very great and dangerous extent by the whole Dutch population of South Africa. As soon as that conviction took possession of our minds, we saw that all hope of preserving the exact settlement of our relations with the Transvaal which was made by Lord Carnarvon was at an end; but we thought we saw our way to a plan by which everything which was of any importance in that

settlement could be easily secured, and we told President Brand that we should be ready to propose such a plan, provided the insurgents "ceased from armed opposition."

The Government had no doubt, however, that this alternative plan would be more easily carried into effect if Sir George Colley obtained an advantage in the field and dispersed the insurgents. We did not, accordingly, think it right to allow our willingness largely to alter the arrangements of Lord Carnarvon to interfere with the action of our armies, and *carte blanche* as to all military movements was left to Sir George Colley. I, for one, have no hesitation in saying, that while I should have thought it absurd, and worse than absurd, to fight for the preservation in its entirety of Lord Carnarvon's settlement, I thought that the new settlement which we were prepared to make would be far more easily and better carried into effect, if Sir George Colley had the kind of rapid, and comparatively bloodless, success over the insurgents which we had a right to expect from one who was considered to be amongst the most rising soldiers in the British army, at the head of regular forces, which regular forces he could have had augmented to any extent merely for the asking; for, as hon. members know, the War Office offered to him far larger reinforcements than he cared to take.

People must keep in view this very important fact, that while we informed the friends of the Boers that we were perfectly ready to negotiate if they "ceased from armed opposition and dispersed to their homes," we were most anxious not to hamper our general. It would have been grossly unjust if we had done so; but, at the same time, it would have been most impolitic if we had forgotten that *the* object which we wished to obtain, whether by military success or by negotiation, was such an arrangement of things in the Transvaal as might prevent a violent development of race-hatred between the Englishman and the Dutchman in South Africa. We did not believe that a speedy and easy success in the field would lead to such a development. On the contrary, we thought it would help us to prevent it.

The fortune of war, however, willed it otherwise. Our commander was defeated and slain after three engagements, fought with a force of six companies against an enemy which, in each of these engagements, had advantages so overwhelming that, although there may have been some good military reasons for fighting, no military man has yet been able to explain what those reasons were. These checks were, as Sir Evelyn Wood has very properly said, absolutely unimportant with reference to our military *prestige*, but they altered the political situation not a little.

After the Majuba disaster it became perfectly evident that there was no question of a speedy and easy victory. The Dutch feeling

through South Africa was profoundly excited, and the very next check might have brought us face to face with a wide and general insurrection, the war-cry of which would have been, Up with the Dutch and down with the English!

That was a grave peril, and we took measures accordingly. We directed such a force, naval and military, towards the shores of South Africa, as would have sufficed to pulverise any possible resistance in the Transvaal or elsewhere. We did that; but I confess we shuddered at the bloody and hateful work that might be before us. But did we lower our tone, did we diminish our demands on the Boer leaders after our defeats? In no way. We insisted in the end of February precisely on what we insisted upon in the beginning of January. In other words, while we did not allow our willingness to negotiate to interfere with the perfect military liberty of our commanders, we did not allow the unhappy failure of one commander to interfere in any way with our willingness to negotiate. We did not lower our terms because of the increased danger of revolt; we did not raise them, or break off negotiations altogether, from a silly fear about our military *prestige*, or from a desire for revenge. We poured troops into South Africa, and said, Now, will you have what we offered you six weeks ago, or will you not?

A clever *advocatus diaboli* against the Government managed to draw a picture of what he called "Surrender's Progress," and was so pleased with his own work that he described it as "Hogarthian." He forgot, however, that the great merit of the artist to whom he likened himself was his truth, and that even the most superficial resemblance to truth could not be conferred upon his picture, except by torturing telegrams, as if they were his old and natural enemies, phrases in deeds, and clauses in Acts of Parliament, while his "descending scale" had this ludicrous peculiarity, that whereas it *ought* to have ended, in order to preserve its descending character, in the British demands gradually becoming lower at each defeat, it *did* end in the Boers retracting all their unreasonable demands and agreeing to everything we had asked.

They said, "We are ready, if the troops are ordered to withdraw from the Transvaal, to give them free passage and to withdraw from our position."

We said, "The troops shall not withdraw from the Transvaal, and you shall withdraw from your position." Or, in other words, we enforced the stipulation on which we had insisted from the very beginning of the discussions—that is, as far back as the 10th of January—that the condition precedent to the Crown's inquiry into the Boers' complaint by a Royal Commission (the usual method by which the Crown inquires into the grievances of its subjects) was that the Boers should "desist from armed opposition." Whether

the process of returning every man to his own home and peaceful avocations, while our garrisons remain, the British flag flies where it flew before the outbreak, and the country is administered in the Queen's name, is described as "laying down their arms and going to their homes," or "going to their homes and laying aside their rifles," or "desisting from armed opposition," or "ceasing from armed opposition and dispersing," or "withdrawing from their positions while they leave us in ours," seems to me, as the Germans say, "colossally unimportant."

Now I come to the agreement which was made with the Boers, and the reasons of it. The course of policy which the Government has adopted in this matter is one which it is impossible to vindicate by the strongest arguments which can be adduced in its favour, without falling into plagiarism. The situation is not a new one, and what has to be said about it was said many years ago, as well as it could be said, in this House by one of the greatest English orators in the best speech he ever made in Parliament. Members, whose attention has not lately been called to Mr. Burke's speech on "Conciliation with America," will be, I think, not a little surprised to find how perfectly many of the charges which the gainsayers of the Government policy have been making, are answered in that memorable oration.

"South Africa," hon. gentlemen opposite say, "is worth fighting for." "Certainly it is," Mr. Burke would have replied, "if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen, in this respect, will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who wield the thunder of the State may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favour of prudent management than of force; considering force not as an odious, but as a feeble instrument." Then Mr. Burke went on to give four reasons against the use of force in dealing with America, every one of which applies just as much to our dealing with South Africa.

"First," he said, "the use of force is *temporary*; a nation which is held by conquest may have to be conquered again and again."

"Secondly, the use of force is *uncertain*."

"Thirdly, if you use force you *impair the object* by your very endeavours to preserve it." But here his words are so curiously appropriate to the present situation that I must quote them in their entirety:—

"The thing you fought for is not the thing which you recover; but depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest. Nothing less will content me than *whole* America [South Africa]. I do not choose to consume its strength along with our own, because in all parts it is the British strength that I consume."

hope hon. gentlemen will not think it beneath the dignity

of the subject if I repeat to them a remark which was made to me, at the beginning of the recent rising, by a member of this House who has been long, and creditably, connected with the commerce of South Africa. "Every Boer who is killed in the war will mean," he said, "ten fewer bales of wool exported per annum."

The fourth reason against the use of force, which Mr. Burke gave, was one which was strong in his own day and for his purpose, but is twenty-fold, fifty-fold stronger in our day and for my purpose.

"We have no sort of *experience*," he said, "in favour of force as an instrument in the rule of our colonies. Their growth and their utility has been owing to methods altogether different. Our ancient indulgence has been said to be pursued to a fault. It may be so; but we know, if feeling is evidence, that our fault was more tolerable than our attempt to mend it; and our sin far more salutary than our penitence."

The whole of our Colonial policy, for more than a generation, has been built upon that idea, the idea that it would be impossible, even if the conscience of the nation would permit it, to hold together our gigantic empire by force. It would be a betrayal of our trust to consent too readily and too easily to give up a territory which had been fairly incorporated with the Empire. Whenever there is reason to suppose that the acts of resistance to authority are merely the acts of a party, even of a strong party, in any community, then our first duty is to make the law respected, but if it becomes clear that the objection to our rule is not one that can be removed by concessions to opinion, however judicious, and that it is the determination of the vast majority of any community of European blood to set up for itself, it is very difficult to see how we could, consistently with the views which are held by nine Englishmen out of ten, continue to keep that community in subjection by mere naked force.

That, I apprehend, would be the view of most people, with regard even to countries which have grown into importance from nothing at all, under the shadow of the British Empire. But the whole object of our colonial policy should be to make the position of the real British colonist in the world so agreeable, that he may desire nothing more earnestly than that he should remain closely connected with the mother country. Of course, however, it is an entirely different thing when we are dealing with the Transvaal, a country which has no organic connection with the Empire at all, our connection with which is merely a thing of yesterday, and with which we should never have been connected if we had known the facts of the case as we know them now.

But it is objected that we are lowering the dignity of the Crown by making concessions. Again Mr. Burke supplies a ready answer.

"Peace implies reconciliation; and, where there has been a material dispute, reconciliation does in a manner always imply concession on the one part or on

the other. In this state of things I make no difficulty in affirming that the proposal ought to originate from us. Great and acknowledged force is not impaired, either in effect or in opinion, by an unwillingness to exert itself. The superior power may offer peace with honour and with safety. Such an offer from such a power will be attributed to magnanimity. But the concessions of the weak are the concessions of fear. When such a one is disarmed, he is wholly at the mercy of his superior, and he loses for ever that time and those chances which, as they happen to all men, are the strength and resources of all inferior power."

Members will observe the phrase, "Peace with honour," and will not fail to note that it was originally used to describe a transaction exactly analogous to that in which we have been engaged in South Africa.

Then there was a grave and learned person¹ who told us that we had "dismembered the Empire." A man must have a strange notion of this mighty body politic, in which the gigantic mass of British India is lost as a stone thrown into water, who thinks that it makes much matter what are the relations between its head and the farmers of the Transvaal; but here, too, Mr. Burke shall speak.

"Who are you that you should fret, and rage, and bite the chains of nature? Nothing worse happens to you than does to all nations who have extensive empire; and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt, and Arabia, and Kurdistan as he governs Thrace; nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers which he has at Brusa and Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The Sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein that he may govern at all; and the whole of the force and vigour of his authority in his centre is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is, perhaps, not so well obeyed as you are in yours. She complics too; she submits; she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire."

It remains to notice some of the objections, and to reply to some of the questions that have been addressed to us.

Much eloquence has been expended on the phrase, "Self-government is to be given to the Boers," and the country was told that these were not the words of Sir Evelyn Wood, for "a soldier could not use jargon of that kind."

The answer to that is at once simple and brief. Jargon, or no jargon, the words are the words of Sir Evelyn Wood, a thorough soldier, spontaneously chosen to express his meaning, and not suggested, as was insinuated, by any one in Downing Street.

Then the right of cession without an Act of Parliament has been called in question. But that right of cession has been exercised by the Crown over and over again. Not to trouble the House with other instances—of which Aitchison's work on our Indian Treaties is full—the Orange Free State was ceded to its inhabitants by the

(1) Earl Cairns.

prerogative, and that was a far stronger exercise of the prerogative than what is now being done, for we cut the cable altogether in the case of the Orange Free State. It became quite independent, whereas the whole of the Transvaal remains under the suzerainty of the Crown.

A great deal of criticism has been called forth by that same word suzerainty. But what does suzerainty mean? Suzerainty means simply the sovereignty of an over-lord, the relation of an over-lord to his immediate vassal. To take one out of hundreds of examples in India, which I select because it was, some ten years ago, much talked over in this House, the Queen stood in the relation of Suzerain to the once too famous Nawab of Tonk, and that personage stood in the relation of Suzerain to the Thakoor of Lawa. Considering the relation of the Crown to so many native princes in India, it would have been odd that the word suzerainty should have excited so much comment as it has done, even a few years ago; but, that a party, which in 1878 placed the Queen under something very like the suzerainty of the Porte in Cyprus, should say so much against her being made the Suzerain of the Transvaal in 1881, is, indeed, surprising.

The word suzerain ought to be familiar enough, for in the work from which the party opposite took nearly the whole of their foreign policy, occurs the following passage:—

“The only way to manage the Afghans is by Persia and by the Arabs. We will acknowledge the Empress of India as our Suzerain, and secure for her the Levantine coast. If she like she shall have Alexandria as she now has Malta: it could be arranged.”

But it is said, “Oh, but the Queen can’t be Suzerain of a Republic.” Can’t she? Well, then, what were the relations of the Head of the Holy Roman Empire to the Free Towns of Germany? Do we arrogate, since the adoption of the Imperial title in India, a higher rank to the sovereign of these realms than the Middle Age accorded to the Head of the Holy Roman Empire? The fit of Imperialism through which we passed, hardly, I think, brought us to that.

Another objection to the terms of peace is, that it is said we give up the natives in the Transvaal to slavery. That is not true, although, no doubt, apprenticeship has been and may be abused. But it was abused when we and our predecessors were ruling the Transvaal as a Crown Colony. You cannot cure abuses of that kind in a day, hardly in a generation. Many members would say that they have not yet died out in the Cape.

Then it is said that we did wrong to negotiate with persons who were not duly authorised. I ask, if we were to negotiate at all, with whom were we to negotiate except with those who appeared to be the leaders of the people? Of course it would have been

pleasanter to negotiate with persons who had credentials as regular as those of an ambassador in Europe, but there was no such person. The eminent lawyer¹ who made so much of this point should have remembered the legal maxim, *Nemo tenetur ad impossibilia*.

Then a great deal of ridicule has been thrown on the phrase, "control of the foreign relations of the Boers." We have been told that such a phrase has meaning in Berlin or Paris, but none in Pretoria. That is an entire misconception. The South African Republic in 1877 had treaties with Holland, Belgium, and Portugal, whilst its international status had been recognised by Germany, France, and the United States. Any one who has occupied himself with the affairs of South Africa knows that the wildest hopes and the wildest fears have both been built on the foreign relations of the Boers. The same kind of man who has Russophobia on the brain in Asia would get Teutonophobia on the brain at the Cape.

And now I think I have gone through most of the objections that have been made to the recent policy of her Majesty's Government in South Africa. It only remains to say that I am sure South Africa has suffered not a little from its affairs being discussed, in this country, in what I may be permitted to call too high a key.

The change that is being made in our relations to the Transvaal may or may not be wise; but it is simply childish to talk of it as a very mighty matter. Exaggeration of that kind, however, punishes itself. To say that our not wiping out in blood the defeat of six British companies, badly handled by an able but inexperienced commander, was a disgrace so terrible that it could be truly said of it—

" In all the ills we bore,
We grieved, we sighed, we wept,
We never blushed before,"

is simply silly, to say nothing of its being a bull; for we certainly must be held by the man who quoted them with approval to have "blushed" a first time when these lines were originally written. And when were they written? They were written in disparagement of one of the most brilliant pages in English history. Her Majesty's Government may be well content if their colonial policy commends itself as much to posterity as the foreign policy of the great Protector.

(1) Earl Cairns.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.—II.

THE MODERN QUESTION OF THE CALIPHATE.

ABOUT the year 1515 of our era (921 of the Hejra), Selim I., Padishah of the Ottoman Turks and Emperor of Constantinople, finding himself the most powerful prince of his day in Islam, and wishing still further to consolidate his rule, conceived the idea of reviving in his own person the extinct glories of the Caliphate. He had more than one claim to be considered their champion by orthodox Mohammedans, for he was the grandson of that Mahomet II. who had finally extinguished the Roman Empire of the East, and he had himself just ended a successful campaign against the heretical Shah of Persia, head of the Sect of Ali. His only rivals among Sunitic princes were the Sultan el Hind, or, as we call him, the Great Mogul, the Sultan el Gharb, or Emperor of Morocco, and the Mameluke Sultan of Egypt, then known to the world as *par excellence* the Sultan.

With the two former, as rulers of what were remote lands of Islam, Selim seems to have troubled himself little; but he made war on Egypt. In 1516 he invaded Syria, its outlying province, and in 1517 he entered Cairo. There he made prisoner the reigning Mameluke, Kansaw el Ghouri, and had him publicly beheaded, or according to another account received his head from a soldier, who had killed him where he lay on the ground after falling (for the Sultan was an old man) from his horse. He then, in virtue of a very doubtful cession made to him of his rights by one Motawakkel Ibn Omar el Hakim, a descendant of the house of Abbas, whom he found living as titular Caliph in Cairo, took to himself the following style and title: Sultan es Salatin, wa Hakan el Hawakin, Malek el Bahreyn, wa Hami el Barreyn, Khalifeh Rasul Allah, Emir el Mumenin, wa Sultan, wa Khan—titles which may be thus interpreted: King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Monarch of the two seas (the Mediterranean and the Red Sea), and Protector of the two lands (Hejaz and Syria, the holy lands of Islam), Successor of the Apostle of God, Prince of the Faithful, and Emperor. It is said that he first had the satisfaction of hearing his name mentioned in the public prayers as Caliph when he visited the great mosque of Zacharias at Aleppo on his return northwards in 1519.¹

(1) I do not vouch for the entire accuracy of these dates. Turkish historians place Selim's death in 926 A.H., which should correspond with our 1520. It would seem doubtful too whether Selim himself took any higher title with regard to the Holy Places than Khadam el Harameyn, Servant of the two shrines, though his successors are certainly called Hami. It was not till five years after Selim's death that Mecca acknowledged the Ottoman Caliphate.

Such, in a few words, is historically the origin of the modern Caliphate, and such are the titles now borne by Selim's descendant, Abd el Hamid. It is difficult at this distance of time, and in the absence of detailed contemporary narratives, to do more than guess the effect on Mussulmans of his day of Selim's religious pretensions. To all alike, friends as well as foes, he must in the first instance have appeared as an usurper, for before him no man not of the house of Koreysh, and so a kinsman of their Prophet, had ever claimed to be his spiritual heir. Indeed, it was a maxim with all schools of theology of all ages that descent from the Koreysh was the first title to the Caliphate; but we may reasonably suppose that within the limits of his own dominions, and even to the mass of the vulgar beyond them, the Ottoman Emperor's sublime proceedings met with approval. Selim was a portentous figure in Islam; and the splendour of his apparition in the north dazzled the eyes of all. Mussulmans must have seen in him and his house the restorers of their political fortunes and the champion of their religion against Christendom; and a departure from established rule in his favour may well have seemed justified to pious persons as the best hope for the future of their creed. Selim was already temporal lord of the greater part of Islam, and he might be expected thus to restore the spiritual sovereignty also. Besides, to the ears of Mussulmans of the sixteenth century, the Caliphal title was no longer a familiar sound, and the title of Sultan which Selim already bore was that of the highest temporal authority they knew. The Caliphate, if it existed at all, was in the modern world a less imposing name than the Sultanate; and the two had since the destruction of Bagdad become confused, as they still remain, in men's minds who do not any more now make common use of the older title. Thus it was not difficult for the new Sultan of Damascus and Bagdad and Medina to impose himself on the multitude—not merely as heir to the Caliphal possessions, but to the title also of the Caliphs and their spiritual rank. Advantage, too, seems to have been taken in the first instance, as it has been subsequently, of the accidental resemblance of name between Othman, Selim's ancestor, and Othman the third Caliph. The vulgar ear caught the sound as one familiar to it, and was satisfied, for there is all the world in a name.

With the Ulema, however, it was necessary to be more precise; and we know that the question of the Ottoman right to the spiritual succession of the Prophet was one long and hotly debated in the schools. Tradition was formal on the point of excluding aliens to the Koreysh from this its legal inheritance, for Mohammed himself had repeatedly distinguished his own tribe as being the sole heirs to his authority; nor would any doctor of the specially Arabian schools listen to a departure from ideas so absolute. The Hanefite school,

however, representing those chiefly interested in accepting the Ottoman pretension, undertook its legal defence, and succeeded, in spite of the one great obstacle of birth, in making out a very tolerable case for themselves and the Beni Othman—a case which, in the absence of any rival candidate to oppose to them, has since been tacitly accepted by the majority of the Sunite Ulema.

The difficulty, however, was in practice settled by a compromise, and the dispute itself had long been forgotten by all but the learned, until within the present generation its arguments were once more dragged out publicly to serve a political purpose. The Hanefite arguments are on this account interesting, and I have been at pains to ascertain and understand them; but perhaps before I state them in detail it will be best first briefly to run over the Caliphal history of an earlier age and describe the state of things which Selim's act superseded.

Orthodox Mussulman writers recognise four distinct phases which the office of Khalifeh has undergone, and four distinct periods of its history. The word Khalifeh, derived from the Arabic root *khalafa*, to "leave behind," signifies literally one left behind, and in the legal sense the relict or successor of the prophet and heir to his temporal and spiritual power. The *first* historical phase noticed is one of pure theocracy in which the Caliph or successor of Mohammed was saint as well as priest and king, and was to a certain extent inspired. It lasted thirty years only, and is represented by the four great Caliphs—Abu Bekr, Omar, Othman, and Ali—who receive from the faithful when they speak of them the title of Seydna, or Our Lord. The *second* phase, which lasted nearly six hundred years, is that of the Arabian monarchy, in which the Caliphate took the shape of hereditary temporal dominion. Its representatives are neither saints nor doctors of the law, and stand on a quite different footing from those who precede them. They begin with Mawiyeh ibn Ommiyah, founder of the Ommiad dynasty, and end with Mostasem Billah, the last Sultan of the Abbasides. The *third* period is a phase of temporal interregnum during which for nearly three hundred years the Khalifeh exercised no sovereign rights, and resided as a spiritual chief only, or as we should now say Sheykh el Islam, at Cairo. The temporal authority of Islam, which is theoretically supposed to have been continued without break even during this period, was then in delegation with the Memluk Sultans of Egypt and other Mussulman princes. The *last* phase is that of the Ottoman Caliphate.

As nearly all modern arguments respecting the Caliphate appeal to examples in the earliest period, it will be well to consider the origin of its institution and the political basis of Islam itself. Mohammedan doctors affirm that the Apostle of God, Mohammed (on whose name be peace), when he fled from Mecca, did so not as a

rebellious citizen but as a pretender to authority. He was by birth a prince of the princely house of the Koreysh, itself the noblest tribe of Hejaz, and his grandfather had been supreme ruler in Mecca. He established himself, therefore, with his companions in exile as head of an independent political community, following in this the ancient custom of Arabia where sections constantly cut themselves off from the parent tribe and form new nations under the separate leadership of one or another member of their princely families. Islam, therefore, was from its commencement a political as well as a religious body, and while Mohammed preached to his disciples as a prophet, he also gave laws to them as their king and governor. He was their Imam, the leader of their prayer, and he was their Emir and Kadi, prince and magistrate. Thus the supreme temporal and spiritual authority became linked, and Islam was from its beginning a nation no less than a church.

As long as Mohammed lived, this state of things remained unquestioned, and difficulties began only at his death. It is a point which has been much disputed what were the prophet's intentions regarding this event. In early times the sect of Ali maintained that he had appointed his son-in-law his heir, and others have held that Abu Bekr had the nomination; but Sunites are now mostly agreed that no individual appointment was made, and that the choice of a successor was left to be decided by election. In any case the procedure followed by Mohammed's bereaved followers was elective, and its details were in strict accordance with that Arabian custom on which the Koranic law is mainly built.

Now, in an Arab tribe, when the Sheykh dies, the elders of the tribe, heads of its great houses and sections, assemble in one of their number's tent and, sitting in a circle, discuss the subject of his succession. Theoretically, the choice of a successor is open to any one of them, for the tribe, however large, is all one great family, descended from a common ancestor, and though no one from without could be admitted to the supreme rule, any one from within the tribe can hold office. But in practice the choice is limited to a few persons. The reverence of the Arabs for blood, and for selected strains of blood, prevent them, except in very exceptional cases, from changing the dynasty of their rulers. If the dead man has left behind him a son of full age and respectable qualities, he will, without dispute, be acknowledged Sheykh. If not, an uncle, a nephew, or a cousin will be chosen. Only in extreme circumstances of general danger, or of failure of heirs male, can the member of a new family reasonably aspire to power. Moreover, there is no uniform law of election. The meeting does not pretend to give a right, only to confirm one; for the right lies not with the electors but with him who can maintain his election. There is, therefore, no formal system of

voting, but the elders having ascertained who among the dead man's relations commands the strongest following, proceed to acknowledge him by the ceremony of giving him their hands. He then becomes their Sheykh. It sometimes happens, however, that parties are so evenly divided between rival leaders that the tribe divides, one section going this way and the other that, until one of the leaders gives in his submission; otherwise the quarrel is decided by the sword.

All these features of the Arabian tribal system of succession may be noticed in the first elections to the Caliphate. As soon as it was known that Mohammed was indeed dead, a conclave composed of the elders and chief men of Islam, self-constituted and recognising no special popular mandate, assembled in the house of Omar ibn el Khattab. This conclave is known to jurists as the *Ahl el helli wa el agde*, the people of the loosing and the knotting, because they assumed the duty of solving the knotty question of succession. A nice point had to be decided, just such a one as has in all ages been the cause of civil war in Arabia. The Prophet had left no son, but more than one near relation. Moreover, at that moment the new nation of Islam was in danger of internal disruption, and the religious and the civil elements in it were on the point of taking up arms against each other. The two chief candidates were Ali ibn Abutaleb and Abu Bekr, the one son-in-law and cousin and the other father-in-law of Mohammed—Ali represented the civil, Abu Bekr the religious party; and as it happened that the latter party was predominant at Medina, it was on Abu Bekr that the choice fell. He was recognised as head of the more powerful faction, and the chiefs gave him their hands; while civil war was only prevented by the magnanimous submission of Ali.

This form of succession is held by most Sunite doctors to be the authentic form intended by the Prophet, nor did the three following elections differ from it in any essential point. It is only noticed that Abu Bekr designated Omar as the most fitting person to succeed him, and so in a measure directed the choice of the *Ahl el agde*. The Caliph was in each instance elected by the elders at Medina, and the choice confirmed by its general acknowledgment elsewhere.

In the time of Ali, however, a new principle began to make its appearance, which foreshadowed a change in the nature of the Caliphate. The election of Abu Bekr, as I have said, was determined by the predominant religious feeling of the day. He was the holiest man in Islam, and his government was throughout strictly theocratic. He not only administered the religious law, but was its interpreter and architect. He sat every day in the *mejlis* or open court of justice, and decided there questions of divinity as well as of jurisprudence. He publicly led the prayer in the Mosque, expounded the

Koran, and preached every Friday from the pulpit. He combined in his person all the functions now divided between the Sheykh el Islam, the grand Mufti, and the executive authorities. He was king and priest and magistrate, doctor of civil and religious law, and supreme referee on all matters whether of opinion or practice; he was, in a word, the Pope of Islam. Nor did his three successors abate anything of Abu Bekr's pretensions. The only power they delegated was the command of the Mussulman armies, which were then overrunning the world, and the government of the provinces those had conquered. Ali, however, when he at last succeeded to the Caliphate, found himself opposed by the very party whose candidate he had once been, and this party had gathered strength in the interval. With the conquest of the world worldly ideas had filled the hearts of Mussulmans, and a strong reaction also had set in in favour of those specially national ideas of Arabia which religious fervour had hitherto held in check. It was natural, indeed inevitable, that this should be the case, for many conquered nations had embraced the faith of Islam, and, as Mussulmans, had become the equals of their conquerors, so that what elements of pride existed in these found their gratification in ideas of race and birth rather than of religion, ideas which the conquered races could not share, and which were the special inheritance of Arabia. The national party, then, had been reinforced, at the expense of the religious, among the Koreysh, who were still at the head of all the affairs of State. Their leader was Mawiyeh Ibn Ommiyeh, a man of distinguished ability and of that charm of manner which high-born Arabs know so well how to use to their political ends. He had for some years been Governor of Syria, and was more popular there than the pious Ali; and Syria though not yet the nominal was already the real seat of the Mussulman Government. Mawiyeh therefore refused to accept Ali's election at Medina as valid, and finding himself supported by a rival Ahl el agde at Damascus, made that appeal to the sword which Arabian usage sanctions as the ultimate right of all pretenders.

Religious writers agree in condemning Mawiyeh for his revolt; and while his succession to Ali is accepted as legal, they place him on quite a different level from the four Caliphs who preceded him. In Mawiyeh they see fulfilled that prediction of their Prophet, which announced that Islam should be ruled for thirty years by an Imam, and ever after by a King. Mawiyeh is, indeed, the type of all the later Mohammedan Emperors. According to canon law, the head of the State is also head of the religion, but Mawiyeh ceased to exercise religious functions in person. These, unlike his predecessors, he delegated to others, and neither led the prayer nor preached; nor was he held to be either the best or the most learned man in Islam, as Abu Bekr and the rest had been. Moreover—and this is the chief

dynastic point noticed regarding him—he introduced the system of heredity into the Caliphate, nominating his son Yezid his successor in his own lifetime. The change, advantageous as it was politically, is regarded as a religious falling off. Henceforth the Caliphs, whether of the Ommiad or afterwards of the Abbaside families, were not in reality elected, though the form of confirmation by the Ulema was gone through; and they affected to succeed by right of birth, not by the voice of the people. During the whole period of the Arabian Caliphate we only notice one Prince of the Faithful who busied himself much with religious learning, and few who personally exercised the magisterial functions. Only once we read of an Abbaside Caliph insisting on his right of leading the prayer, and this was probably the effect of an accidental jealousy. As a rule the temporal government of Islam was intrusted to a *Sadrassam* or Grand Vizier, the spiritual duty of prayer to a *Naib* or deputy Imam, and the elaboration or interpretation of law and doctrine to such Ulema or Mujtaheddin as could command a following. The character of the Khalifeh, however, was still essentially sacred. He was of the Koreysh and of the blood of the Prophet, and so was distinct from the other princes of the world. As their political power decayed, the Abbasides fell indeed into the hands of adventurers who even occasionally used them as puppets for their own ambitious ends; but the office was respected, and neither the Kurdish Saladdin, nor Togral Bey, nor Malek Shah, nor any of the Seljukian Emirs el Amara dared meddle personally with the title of Caliph.

The Ommiad dynasty, founded by Mawiyeh, reigned at Damascus eighty-five years, and was then succeeded on a new appeal to the sword in A.D. 750 by the descendants of another branch of the Koreysh—the Beni Abbas—who transferred the capital of Islam to Bagdad, and survived as temporal sovereigns there for five hundred years.

This second period of Islam, though containing her greatest glories and her highest worldly prosperity, is held to be less complete by divines than the first thirty years which had preceded it. Islam was no longer one. To say nothing of the Persian and Arabian schisms, the orthodox world itself was divided, and rival Caliphs had established themselves independently in Spain and Egypt. Moreover, during the last two centuries the temporal power of the Caliphs was, practically in delegation to the Seljuk Turks, who acted as mayors of the palace, and their spiritual power was unsupported by any show of sanctity or learning. It was terminated forcibly by the pagan Holagu, who at the head of the Mongols sacked Bagdad in 1258.

The third period of Caliphal history saw all temporal power wrested from the Caliphs. Islam, on the destruction of the Arabian monarchy, resolved itself into a number of separate States, each governed by its

own Bey or Sultan, who in his quality of temporal prince was head also of religion within his own dominions. The Mongols, converted to the Faith of Mecca, founded a Mohammedan empire in the East; the Seljuk Turks, replaced by the Ottoman, reigned in Asia Minor; the Barbary States had their own rulers; and Egypt was governed by that strange dynasty of slaves, the Mameluke Sultans. Nowhere was a supreme temporal head of Islam to be seen, and the name of Khalifeh as that of a reigning sovereign ceased any longer to be heard of in the world. Only the nominal succession of the Prophet was obscurely preserved at Cairo, whither the survivors of the family of Abbas had betaken themselves on the massacre of their house at Bagdad.

It is difficult to ascertain the precise position of these titular Caliphs under the Mameluke monarchy in Egypt. That they were little known to the world in general is certain; and one is sometimes tempted to suspect the complete authenticity of the succession preserved through them. Contemporary Christian writers do not mention them, and it is evident from Sir John Mandeville and others that in Syria the Egyptian Sultan himself was talked of as head of the Mussulman religion. I have heard their position compared with that of the present Sheykh el Islam in Cairo and Constantinople—that is to say they were appointed by the Sultan, and were made use of by him as a means of securing Mussulman allegiance—and I believe this to have been all their real status. They are cited, however, as in some sense sovereigns by Hanefite teachers, whose argument it is that the succession of the Prophet has never lapsed, or Islam been without a recognised temporal head. The Sultans, neither of Egypt nor of India, nor till Selim's time of the Turkish Empire, ever claimed for themselves the title of Khalifeh, nor did the Sherifal family of Mecca, who alone of them might have claimed it legally as Koreysh. Neither did Tamerlane nor any of the Mussulman Mongols who reigned at Bagdad. The fact is, we may assume the Caliphate was clean forgotten at the time Selim bethought him of it as an instrument of power.

It must, then, have been an interesting and startling novelty with Mussulmans to hear of this new pretender to the ancient dignity—interesting, because the name Khalifeh was connected with so many of the bygone glories of Islam; startling, because he who claimed it seemed by birth incapable of doing so. The Hanefite Ulema, however, as I have said, undertook Selim's defence, or rather that of his successors, for Selim himself died not a year afterwards, and succeeded in proving, to the general satisfaction of the majority of Sunites, that the house of Othman had a good and valid title to the rank they had assumed. Their chief arguments were as follows. The house of Othman, they asserted, ruled spiritually by—

1. *The right of the sword*, that is to say, the *de facto* possession of the sovereign title. It was argued that, the Caliphate being a necessity (and this all orthodox Mussulmans admit), it was also necessary that the *de facto* holder of the title should be recognised as legally the Caliph, *until a claimant with a better title should appear*. Now the first qualification of a claimant was that he should claim, and the second that he should be supported by a party; and Selim had both claimed the Caliphate and supported his pretensions at the head of an army. He had challenged the world to produce a rival, and no rival had been found—none, at least, which the Hanefite school acknowledged, for the Sultan of Morocco they had never accepted, and the last descendant of the Abbasides had waived his rights. In support of the proposition that the sword could give a title they cited the examples of Mawiyeh, who thus established his right against the family of Ali, and of Abu el Abbas, who had thus established his against that of Mawiyeh.

2. *Election*, that is the sanction of a legal body of Elders. It was argued that, as the Ahl el agde had been removed from Medina to Damascus, and from Damascus to Bagdad, and from Bagdad to Cairo, so it had been once more legally removed from Cairo to Constantinople. Selim had brought with him to St. Sophia's some of the Ulema of the Azhar mosque in Cairo, and these, in conjunction with the Turkish Ulema, had elected him or ratified his election. A form of election is to the present day observed at Constantinople in token of this right; and each new Sultan of the house of Othman, as he succeeds to the temporal sovereignty of Turkey, must wait before being recognised as Caliph till he has received the sword of office at the hands of the Ulema. This ceremony it is customary to perform in the mosque of Ayub.

3. *Nomination*. Sultan Selim, as has been already said, obtained from Mutawakkel, a descendant of the Abbasides and himself titularly Caliph, a full cession of all the Caliphal rights of that family. The fact, as far as it goes, is historical, and the only flaw in the argument would seem to be that Mutawakkel had no right thus to dispose of a title to an alien, which was his own only in virtue of his birth. The case, indeed, was very much as though the Emperor of Germany, having possessed himself of London, should obtain from Don Carlos a cession of the throne of Spain; or as though Napoleon should have got such a cession of the Papacy, in 1813, from Pius VII. Still it is insisted upon strongly by the Hanefite divines as giving a more permanent dynastic title than either of the previous pleas. As a precedent for nomination they cite the act of Abu Bekr, who on his deathbed recommended Omar as his successor in the Caliphate.

4. *The guardianship of the two shrines*, that is to say of Mecca and Jerusalem, but especially of Mecca. It has been asserted by some of

the Ulema, and it is certainly a common opinion at the present day, that the sovereignty of Hejaz is in itself sufficient title to the Caliphate. It seems certainly to have been so considered in the first age of Islam, and many a bloody war was then fought for the right of protecting the Beyt Allah; but the connection of Hejaz with the Empire of the Caliphs has been too often broken to make this a very tenable argument. In the tenth century it was held by the Karmathian heretics, in the thirteenth by the Imams of Sana, and for seven years in the present century by the Wahhabis. Still the *de facto* sovereignty of the Harameyn, or two shrines, was one of Selim's pleas; and it is one which has reappeared in modern arguments respecting the Caliphal rights of his descendants.

5. *Possession of the Amanat* or sacred relics. This last was a plea addressed to the vulgar rather than to the learned; but it is one which cannot be passed by unnoticed here, for it exercises a powerful influence at the present day over the ignorant mass of Mussulmans. It was asserted, and is still a pious belief, that from the sack of Bagdad, in 1258, certain relics of the Prophet and his companions were saved and brought to Cairo, and thence transferred by Selim to Constantinople. These were represented to constitute the Imperial insignia of office, and their possession to give a title to the Caliphal succession. They consisted of the cloak of the Prophet borne by his soldiers as a standard, of some hairs from his beard, and of the sword of Omar. The vulgar believe them to be still preserved in the mosque of Ayub; and though the Ulema no longer insist on their authenticity, they are often referred to as an additional test of the Sultan's right.

Such, then, were the arguments of the Hanefite school, who defended Selim's claim, and such they are with regard to his successors of the house of Othman. By the world at large they seem to have been pretty generally accepted, the more so as the Turkish Sultans, having only a political end in view, were satisfied with their formal recognition by their own subjects, and did not bring the question to an issue with their independent neighbours. Neither the Mogul Emperors at Delhi nor the Sheriffs of Morocco were called upon to acknowledge temporal or spiritual supremacy in the Ottoman Sultans, nor did these affect an every-day use of the ancient title they had assumed. In India the head of the house of Othman was still known to Moslems as Padishah or Sultan er Roum, the Roman Emperor, the most powerful of Mussulman princes, but not in any special manner the head of their religion, certainly not their sovereign. The Ulema, indeed, such as were Hanefites, admitted him to be legally Khalifeh; but many of the Shafite school denied this, pleading still that as an alien to the Koreysh his claim was illegal, while to the ignorant mass of the people he remained almost unknown. The Sultans themselves were doubtless to blame for this,

seeing that the spiritual functions of their new office were left almost entirely unperformed. For it cannot be too strongly insisted on that the assumption of the Caliphate was to the house of Othman only a means to an end, viz. the consolidation of its worldly power upon a recognised basis, and that, once that end obtained, the temporal dignity of Sultan was all that they really considered. Thus they never sought to exercise the right appertaining to the Caliphal office of appointing Naïbs, or Deputy Imams, in the lands outside their dominions, or to interfere with doctrinal matters at home, except where such might prejudice the interests of their rule. With regard to these, the theologians of Constantinople, having satisfactorily settled the Caliphal dispute, and pronounced the house of Othman for ever heirs to the dignity they had assumed, were recommended by the head of the State to busy themselves no further with doctrinal matters, and to consider the *ijtihad*, or development of new dogma, altogether closed for the future in their schools. Soliman the Magnificent, Selim's heir, especially insisted upon this. He had already promulgated a series of decrees affecting the civil administration of his empire, which he had declared to be immutable; and an immutability, too, in dogma he thought would still further secure the peace and stability of his rule. Nor did he meet with aught but approval here from the Hanefite divines. The Turkish Ulema, ever since their first appearance in the Arabian schools in the eleventh century, finding themselves at a disadvantage through their ignorance of the sacred language, and being constitutionally adverse to intellectual effort, had maintained the proposition that mental repose was the true feature of orthodoxy, and in their *fatwas* had consistently relied on authority and rejected original argument. They therefore readily seconded the Sultan in his views. Argument on first principles was formally forbidden in the schools; and for the interpretation of existing law two offices were invented—the one for dogmatic, the other for practical decisions, those of the Sheykh el Islam and the Great Mufti. This closing of doctrinal inquiry by the Ottoman Sultans, and the removal of the seat of supreme spiritual government from the Arabian atmosphere of Cairo to the Tartar atmosphere of the Bosphorus, was the direct and immediate cause of the religious stagnation which Islam suffered from so conspicuously in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

We have now brought the history of the Caliphate down to the period which I described in my last paper as one of intellectual torpor for Islam. It was a lethargy from which there seemed no awakening, and which to contemporaries, Voltaire among the rest, seemed closely approximating to the death of unbelief. In spite of Soliman's eternal arrangements, the temporal power of the house of Othman was wofully diminished, and the spiritual prestige of the

Sultans was gone with Mussulmans. By the middle of the last century the title of Caliph, even in their own dominions, was all but forgotten, and the Court of Constantinople was become a byword for its vice and infidelity. It can therefore be well imagined that the awakening of religious feeling, which I also described as having been produced by the Wahhabite movement, especially menaced the Sultan in his Caliphal pretensions. By the beginning of the present century the serious world of Islam was already ripening for a change, and the title of the Caliphate seemed open to whoever should re-invent and prove himself worthy to wear it. Two men certainly then dreamed of its acquisition, both men of supreme genius, and holding the elements of success in their hands. Nor can it be doubted that either of them would have achieved his ambition but for the appearance against them of a material power greater than their own, and which then, for the first time, began to make itself felt as paramount in Asia. That power was England, and the ambitions she thwarted there were those of Bonaparte and Mehemet Ali.

It is not, I believe, sufficiently understood how vast a scheme was overthrown by the Battle of the Nile. Napoleon's mind was formed for dominion in the East, and where he failed in Europe he would have infallibly succeeded in Asia. There little policies are useless, and great ones root themselves in a congenial soil; and he was possessed with an idea which must have flourished. His English opponents, judging him only by the scale of their own thoughts, credited him with the inferior design of invading India through Persia, and called it a mad one; but India was, in fact, a small part only of his programme. When he publicly pronounced the Kelekat at Cairo, and professed the faith of Islam, he intended to be its Head, arguing rightly that what had been possible three hundred years before to Selim was possible also then to him. Nor would the Mussulman world have been much more astonished in 1799 at being asked to accept a Bonaparte for Caliph, than it was in 1519 at being asked to accept an Ottoman. With Napoleon's genius for war, and but for the disastrous sea fight on the Nile, all this might have been, and more; and it is conceivable that Europe, taken in reverse by a great Moslem multitude, might have suffered worse disasters than any the actual Napoleonic wars procured her, while a more durable empire might have been founded on the Nile or Bosphorus than the Bonapartes were able to establish on the Seine. As it was, it was an episode and no more, useful only to the few who saw it near enough to admire and understand.¹

(1) The original diary of Lascaris, Napoleon's agent with the Arabs, has, I understand, within the last two years been discovered at Aleppo and purchased by the French Government. Its publication, whenever that may be decided on, will, if I am not quite mistaken, throw new and important light on Napoleon's Egyptian career.

Among these who saw and understood was Mehemet Ali, the Albanian adventurer, who undertook the government of Egypt when England restored it to the Porte. Bonaparte from the first was his model, and he inherited from him this vision of a new Caliphate, the greatest of the Napoleonic ideas, and worked persistently to realise it. He was within an ace of succeeding. In 1839 Mehemet Ali had Mecca, Cairo, and Jerusalem in his hands, and he had defeated the Sultan at Konia, and was advancing through Asia Minor on Constantinople. There, without doubt, he would have proclaimed himself Caliph, having all the essential elements of the Sultan's admitted right on which to found a new claim.

Nor is it probable that he would have found much religious opposition to the realisation of his scheme from the Turkish Ulema. These, already alarmed by Sultan Murad's administrative reforms, would hardly have espoused the Sultan's defence with any vigour; and though Mehemet Ali himself was open to a charge of latitudinarianism, he had the one great claim upon orthodox Islam of having delivered the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina from the Wahhabis. The house of Othman, indeed, at this time had begun to stink—not only in the nostrils of the outside world, but in that of the Hanefite school itself; and as these had formerly accepted Selim, so they might very well, in 1839, have accepted Mehemet Ali. But this attempt, too, was stopped by England in pursuance of a policy which it is difficult now not to regret. The too venturesome Arnaout was sent back to his vice-royalty in Egypt, and the House of Othman was entrusted with a new lease of spiritual sovereignty, if not yet of spiritual power.

The reigns of Abd el Mejid and of Abd el Aziz are remarkable with Mussulmans as having witnessed a complete dissociation of interests between the Imperial Government and the Old Hanefite school of Ulema. I have no space here to discuss the nature of the reforms attempted and partly effected in the Ottoman Empire between the years 1839 and 1869 as a concession to the clamour of Europe. They were instituted not by and through religion, as they should have been, but in defiance of it, and so failed to find acceptance anywhere with religious people. All changes so attempted must fail in Islam because they have in them the inevitable vice of illegality, and I hope to have an opportunity of explaining later the manner in which alone a true reform can hope to find acceptance. For the present I only note the promulgation of the Hatti Humayoum and its kindred decrees as points in the history of the Ottoman Caliphate's decline, and as direct reasons for the reactionary change of front which we now witness in the policy of Constantinople. Abd el Mejid for his ill-judged attempts gained with Mussulmans the name of an unbeliever, and his son was deposed in

the way we all know as a breaker of the religious law. For a moment, however, Abd el Aziz seems to have seen the true nature of his position and to have had some idea of the rôle required of him, as the following incident will show. It marks at any rate the epoch pretty exactly when a revival of the Sultan's spiritual pretensions, as a settled policy, was first resolved on in Turkey. The circumstances have been narrated to me as follows:—

Quite in the early days of Abd el Aziz's reign a certain statesman, a man of original genius and profoundly versed in the knowledge both of Europe and of the East, and especially of the religious history of Islam, came to Constantinople. He was a friend of Rushdi Pasha, then the Grand Vizier, and of others of the party of Young Turkey, men who were seeking by every means, fair and foul, to reorganise and strengthen the central authority of the Empire. To these, and subsequently, in an interview, to the Sultan himself, he urged the advantage which might accrue to the Ottoman Government both as a means of controlling the provinces and as a weapon against European diplomacy if the spiritual authority of the Sultan as Caliph were put more prominently forward. He suggested especially to Abd el Aziz that his real strength lay in the reorganisation not of his temporal but of his spiritual forces; and he expressed his wonder that so evident a source of strength had been so little drawn on. He pointed out the importance of the Mussulman populations outside the Empire to the Sultan, and urged that these should be brought as much as possible within the sphere of Constantinople influence. The Barbary States, Mussulman India, and Central Asia might thus become to all intents and purposes, save that of tribute, subjects of the Porte. In early times it had been a duty of the Caliphs to appoint in all the provinces of Islam Imams or deputies to represent their spiritual authority, and it was suggested that these should once more be appointed. An Imam, or leader of their public prayer, is a necessity with orthodox Mussulmans, and in default of legal appointment from the Caliph, who is himself the supreme Imam, the faithful had been constrained to apply either to the local governments for such appointment or to elect the functionary themselves. This they acknowledged to be illegal, and would willingly revert to the more legitimate system; while the re-establishment of such a hierarchy would bring an enormous accession of spiritual power to Constantinople. It was also shown to Abd el Aziz how all-important Arabia was to his position, and how greatly the means of influence there had been neglected.

I am informed by one present at this interview that Abd el Aziz was not only delighted at the idea, but profoundly astonished. He seems to have had no notion previously either of the historical

dignity of the spiritual office he held nor of its prerogatives, and for a while his thoughts were turned in the direction pointed out to him. He sent for the chief Ulema and asked them if all he heard was true; and, when he found their ideas to be entirely in unison with the advice just given him, he commissioned the Sheykh el Islam to push forward the doctrine of his spiritual leadership by all the means in his power. Missionaries were consequently despatched to every part of the Mussulman world, and especially to India and the Barbary States, to explain the Hanefite dogma of the Caliphate; and though at first these met with little success they eventually gained their object in those countries where believers were obliged to live under infidel rule, so much so that in a few years the Ottoman Caliphate became once more a recognised "question" in the schools. They were aided in this by a powerful instrument, then first employed in Turkey, the press. A newspaper in Arabic called the *Jawab* was started at Constantinople under the direction of one Achmet Faris, a convert to Islam and a man of great literary ability and knowledge of Arabic, who already had views on the subject of the Caliphate; and this organ consistently advocated the new policy of the Ulema. The official clique in Stamboul were, however, at that time still intent on their own projects, and the party of young Turkey, then in the ascendant, only half understood the part to be played by religion in their scheme of administrative reform for the Empire. Besides—and this was the chief hindrance to the Ulema—Abd el Aziz was not a man capable of seriously carrying out a great political idea, being little else than a man of pleasure. He and his government consequently soon drifted back into the groove of his predecessors' material policy, which relied for its strength on the physical force of arms, foreign loans, and the intrigues of officials. The only practical action taken by Ottoman ministers in the line indicated were the twin crusades proclaimed against the Wahhabis of Hasa and the heretical Imams of Sana. The old Turkish Ulema, however, were not thus to be satisfied. They had determined on carrying out the idea they had adopted, and on forcing the Sultan to put himself openly at the head of a religious and reactionary movement; and when they found that Abd el Aziz could not be made to act consistently as Caliph, they deposed him, and thus opened a way for the true hero of their idea, the present Sultan, Abd el Hamid.

The advent of this latest scion of the house of Othman to the spiritual succession of the Prophet, though a godsend in appearance to religious Moslems, cannot but be regarded by all who wish Islam well as a very great misfortune. It is almost certain that if Abd el Mejid and Abd el Aziz and Murad had been succeeded by another of those senseless monarchs who have so often filled the Imperial throne, the Ottoman Caliphate would already have been a

thing of the past, at least as regards the larger and more intelligent part of Islam. In the collapse of its physical power in 1879, the official camarilla of Constantinople would have been unable to control the movement of revolt against the spiritual and temporal sovereignty of the Sultan, and something would have taken its place offering a more possible foundation for true religious reform. Arabia would in all probability have by this time asserted its independence, and under a new Caliphate of the Koreysh would have been attracting the sympathies and the adhesion of the Eastern world. There might have been schisms and religious convulsions, but at least there would have been life; and what Islam requires is to live. But unfortunately Abd el Hamid was neither a mere voluptuary nor an imbecile, and catching, by an instinct which one cannot but admire, the one rope of safety which remained for him and his house, he placed himself at the head of the extreme reactionary party of Islam, and thus put back for a while the hour of fate. It is difficult to gain accurate information as to Abd el Hamid's character and religious opinions, but I believe it may be safely asserted that he represents in these latter the extremest Hanefite views. In youth he was, for a prince, a serious man, showing a taste for learning, especially for geography and history; and though not an *alem* he has some knowledge of his religion. It may therefore be taken for granted that he is sincere in his belief of his own spiritual position—it is easy to be sincere where one's interest lies in believing; and I have it from one who saw him at the time that on the day soon after his accession, when, according to the custom already mentioned, he received the sword at the mosque of Ayub, he astonished his courtiers with the sudden change in his demeanour. All the afternoon of that day he talked to them of his spiritual rank in language which for centuries had not been heard in the precincts of the Seraglio. It is certain, too, that his first act, when delivered from the pressure of the Russian invasion, was to organize afresh the propagandism already begun, and to send out new missionaries to India and the Barbary States to preach the doctrine of his own Caliphal authority to the Moslems *in partibus infidelium*. His language, too, to strangers from external Islam was from the first that of a spiritual rather than a temporal prince, and with the European Ambassadors he has used this position consistently and most effectually. It is no mean proof of Abd el Hamid's ability that he should have invented the Mussulman *non possumus* with which he has disconcerted our diplomacy. In private life he is said to be regular at his prayers, though it is also said that he conforms to the custom of Turkish Sultans in as regularly espousing a new slave each Friday. He is at the same time a liberal patron of dervishes, workers of miracles, and holy men. These he is at pains to seek out and receive honourably. In his administration he con-

forms, wherever he is himself the actor, strictly to the Sheriat, and on doubtful points consults always the mufti or Sheykh el Islam. He has shown no inconsiderable firmness in resisting European demands when they contravened the canon law.¹

For all these reasons it will be readily understood that Abd el Hamid has gained not only the support of his own old Turkish Ulema, but the sympathy of a very considerable section of opinion outside his dominions. From a traitor to the cause of religion the Ottoman Sultan has come to be looked upon, east and west, as once more its champion; and with the old-fashioned reactionary school Abd el Hamid is fast growing into a hero. A year ago, when I was at Jeddah, this was not yet the case, but it would seem to be so now. Then even the people of his own party spoke of him doubtfully, and he certainly excited no enthusiasm among them. They did not understand him, and thought that he was playing a part. He was said to be of Armenian parentage (on his mother's side) and his sincerity as a Moslem was suspected. It seemed impossible one born in Abd el Mejid's Seraglio should be a serious man. Besides he had not yet shown his strength, and to be strong is to be a hero everywhere. But within the last eight months events have marched rapidly. Abd el Hamid has played his cards successfully in Greece, in Albania, and with the Kurds. He has not been afraid of England and has shown a bold front against infidel reforms. He has had the courage under the eyes of Europe to arrest their *protégé*, Midhat, and to try him for murder. Lastly, the French have played into his hands in Tunis, and he has thus gained a footing of sympathy with the Mussulmans of North Africa, a population which has for centuries opposed his claims. Twenty years ago it would have been absolutely impossible for an Ottoman Sultan to awaken any loyal feeling in any Arab breast. Tunis then specially boasted her independence of the Porte, and even the Hanefites of the sea-coast towns of Africa would have scouted the idea of fighting for the Turk. Now the Malekites themselves, the puritans of Kerwan, are moving at Abd el Hamid's nod. He would seem, too, to be stirring with some success in Egypt, and Indian Mussulmans are praying for him publicly in their mosques. Everywhere the reactionary party is standing to its arms, and is beginning to recognise a leader in this supple Armenian Khalifeh, who is defying Europe, and seems willing, if necessary, to lead them one day on a Jihad.

With all this, however, it must not be supposed that Orthodox

(1) In the recent trial of the murderers of Abd el Aziz, Abd el Hamid has departed from his usual adherence to the Sheriat. It is a lapsus which may one day be taken hold of against him, should the Ulema need to depose him. He is said to have yielded to the advice of an European confidant who directs the details of his diplomacy with Europe.

Islam is by any means yet won back to Constantinople. Turkey, I have shown, and the Hanefite school, are far from being the whole of the Mohammedan world ; and side by side with the fanatical obduracy of the Ottoman State party and the still fiercer puritanism of the Melkites there exists an intelligent and hopeful party favourable to religious reform. Shafite Arabia is its stronghold, but it is powerful too in Egypt and further East. With it a first article of faith is that the House of Othman has been and is the curse of Islam, and that its end is at hand. In spite of Abd el Hamid's pious appeals to the Sheriat they look upon him as one who troubleth Islam. He is the representative of the party most bitterly opposed to all of good. They know that as long as there is an Ottoman Caliph, whether his name be Abd el Aziz or Abd el Hamid, moral progress is impossible, that the ijtahad cannot be re-opened, and that no such reformation of doctrine and practice can be attempted as would alone enable their faith to cope with modern infidelity. They see moreover that, notwithstanding his affected legality, Abd el Hamid's rule is neither juster nor more in accordance with the Mussulman law than that of his predecessors. The same vices of administration are found in it, and the same recklessness for his Mussulman subjects' welfare. Of all the lands of Islam his own are probably those where Abd el Hamid has now the most scanty following. Constantinople is after all his weak point, for the Young Turkish school is far from dead, the vicissitudes of life and death follow each other closely on the Bosphorus, and the liberal party can better afford than the reactionary to wait. The death or fall of Abd el Hamid, whenever it may happen, would immediately decide a movement counter to the Ottoman Caliphate.

What form this may eventually take I shall endeavour in my next paper to show.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

(To be continued.)

THE RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN PERGAMON.

THE ancient and once splendid city of Pergamon, still known by the name of Bergama, is situated in the rich valley of the Caicus (hod. Bakir Tschai) about ten miles from that portion of the coast of Mysia which lies opposite to Mitylene. Above the city to the N.E. rises a steep and rocky conical hill (ὄρος στροβιλοειδές, Strabo) to the height of 1,000 feet, the site no doubt of the first settlement, and in later times the Acropolis of Pergamon. On either side of this natural fortress flow two small streams, the Selinus and the Ketios (hod. Bergama Tschai) from the N., the former of which passing through it to the W., and the latter washing its eastern walls, mingle with the Caicus at a short distance from the city. Little or nothing is known of the origin of Pergamon. The Pergamenians regarded themselves as the descendants of Greek colonists from Arcadia, who settled in Asia under the Heraclid Telephus, and derived their name from Pergamus, a son of Pyrrhus. The latter, it was said, came to Pergamon with his mother Andromache, and assumed the sovereignty of Teuthrania after a single combat with its ruler Arius.¹

Pergamon, however, remained comparatively insignificant until the death of Alexander, and owed its rise to one of the great monarch's greatest generals and successors, Lysimachus. The natural strength of the place appears to have attracted his attention, and during his struggle with Seleucus he chose it as his treasure house,² and deposited the vast sum of nine thousand talents in the Acropolis under the guardianship of the Pontian general Philetærus. The latter, who appears to have been a truly attached servant, remained faithful to his trust for several years; and when he changed sides and gave up the citadel to Seleucus, he was influenced rather by the instinct of self-defence than by a treacherous and selfish disposition.

Lysimachus in his old age had fallen into the hands, or rather the arms, of the beautiful Arsinoë, who proved to be a second Phædra. After compassing the murder of her stepson, the excellent Agathocles, she directed her machinations against Philetærus, as an adherent of her victim, and left him no other course than to seek the protection of Seleucus. Having once changed sides, Philetærus appears to have carried out the policy of the Vicar of Bray. "By fair promises and occasional services to the strongest and nearest," of the successive masters and plunderers of Asia Minor, "he continued for

(1) Pausan., i. 11, 2.

(2) Strabo, Lib. XIII. p. 623, ἦν μὲν δὲ τὸ Πέργαμον Λυσιμάχου γιζοφυλάκιον.

twenty years to maintain himself in the possession of the Acropolis of Pergamon *and the treasure.*"¹

Philetaerus bequeathed his money and his policy to his nephew Eumenes I., who not only kept possession of his dominions in very difficult circumstances, but extended them, and consolidated his authority. His successor (in 241 B.C.), the famous Attalus I., found himself in a position to assume the title as well as the power of an independent king. He was wise enough to foresee the triumph of the Romans in their struggle with the splendid but brittle monarchies of Asia, and to seek strength and safety in a firm alliance with the irresistible Republic. Under Attalus, too, the new dynasty which had been founded and strengthened by a cautious policy, was rendered illustrious by great deeds of arms against the Gauls, the common enemies of the Greek and Roman world.

These terrible invaders poured into Asia Minor on the invitation of Nicomedes, King of Bithynia, in 278 B.C. After plundering the shores of the Hellespont, Ionia, and Æolia, they settled on the river Halys, and received tribute from nearly all the States west of the Taurus range. Attalus alone refused submission, and in a battle near his capital, Pergamon, gained a decisive victory² over the barbarians, and compelled them to confine themselves to a province in the interior, which received its name of Galatia from them.

The moral elevation consequent on this new victory of Hellenic civilisation over barbarism gave a fresh impulse to plastic art, for which the events of the Gallic wars furnished appropriate subjects. The victories of Attalus inspired the art of Pergamon. With true Greek feeling the victor sought to record the glories of his triumph in Athens, the once hallowed centre of Greek life, and rejoiced to write his name in plastic characters in the roll of heroes who, like himself, had maintained the supremacy of the Hellenic race. Pausanias tells us that Attalus I. offered four groups of statues at Athens, which were set up on the south wall of the Acropolis, viz. 1. The Battle of the Gods and Giants, "who once dwelt in Thrace and the isthmus of Pallene;" 2. The Battle of the Athenians and Amazons; 3. The Battle of Marathon; and 4. The Destruction of the Gauls in Mysia by Attalus.

Of these marble groups it is more than probable that we possess very considerable remains. Professor Brunn³ was the first to direct attention to a very remarkable series of statues of barbarian type, scattered through the museums of Venice, Naples, Rome, and Paris, but having a common *provenance*. Among these are figures belonging to all four groups—Giants, Amazons, Persians, and numerous Gallic warriors, in every variety of attitude expressive of defeat

(1) Strabo, *l.c.*

(2) For date of this battle *vide* Niebuhr's *Kleine Schriften*, and Clinton, F. H. p. 413.

(3) *Arch. Zeit.* 1865, *Anzeiger*, p. 66.

and approaching death. The extraordinary fidelity with which the ethnological peculiarities of the barbarian type are rendered in these statues renders them marvels of realistic art.

The well-known notice of Pliny respecting the art of Pergamon refers to a later period. "*Several artists,*" he says, "*represented the battles of Eumenes against the Gauls, viz. Isigonus, Phrymonachus, Stratonicus, and Antigonus.*" These works, of course, were in Pergamon itself, and in bronze. In his report of the recent excavations at Pergamon, Professor Conze¹ says, "We may now confidently assert that we have found the battle-pieces of which Pliny speaks." It is probable that the famous statue falsely called the "Dying Gladiator" in the Capitol, and the touching group of "The Gaul Killing his Wife," in the Villa Ludovisi at Rome, belonged to another marble group at Pergamon. But we are at present more immediately concerned with the sculptures of the *Altar of Pergamon*, which there are good palæographical reasons for referring to the reign of Eumenes II., who succeeded Attalus in 197 B.C. The son inherited both the martial spirit and the artistic tastes of his great father; and by valour and policy and a liberal patronage of the arts, raised his kingdom and his capital to the highest point of prosperity and grandeur which they were destined to reach.

It appears that the victory of Attalus, brilliant as it was, did not permanently destroy the strength and spirit of the Galatians. In alliance with Bithynia they once more invaded Pergamon in 168 B.C., and were defeated by Eumenes II. in this final struggle with tremendous loss. Surrounded as he was by jealous and warlike neighbours, Eumenes saw that he could only maintain his independence by a strict alliance with the Romans. He afforded them valuable assistance in their Aetolian and Syrian campaigns, and especially at the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C.), in which Scipio broke the power of Antiochus the Great. Eumenes was richly rewarded for his services, and obtained from the grateful Romans, with whom he made himself personally popular during a visit to Rome, the Thracian Chersonese and nearly all the country to the west of the Taurus range. Antiochus was compelled to pay him 359 talents for his war expenses, and 127 talents in lieu of a yearly tribute of corn; and as an especial honour to the son of Attalus, the friend of the Roman people, he received the elephants which formed part of the spoils of the defeated Syrian king. We may judge of the favour with which he was regarded at Rome from the fact that on his second visit Cato complained of the honours which were paid him.²

Eumenes was now at the summit of his power and prosperity, and

(1) *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen zu Pergamon*, 1880.

(2) Plutarch, "Cato Major."

it is reasonable to conjecture that it was at this period of his life that he applied himself to the adornment of his capital, and made Pergamon worthy of the extent and prosperity of the empire he had won. He employed the vast wealth which he had inherited and acquired in attracting men of letters and artists to his court, and rendered Pergamon second only to Alexandria itself, as a centre of Hellenic learning and civilisation in Asia Minor. "Eumenes II.," says Strabo,¹ "built the city, and planted the Grove of Nikephorion; and out of his love of magnificence and beauty erected buildings as offerings to the gods, and founded libraries,² and made Pergamon the splendid abode which it now is." We now know that one of the most remarkable of these great works was an altar of vast size dedicated *Διὶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Νικηφόρῳ*, the plastic ornament of which has been recently discovered in a wonderfully good state of preservation by a German expedition.

Magnificent as we now know this work to have been, it has left only the very faintest traces in ancient literature. A few years ago its existence was hardly suspected, and it is almost by what we call an accident that this grand monument of Hellenic-Asiatic art has been brought once more to the light of day. The merit of the first discovery belongs to Mr. Humann, a Westphalian engineer, who, though not an archæologist, had acquired some knowledge of Greek art in the cast-museums of his country. While employed in the year 1869 in making roads in the neighbourhood of Pergamon, he had witnessed the destruction of a large number of sculptured marbles by Turks and Greeks, and had taste enough to recognise their value. He at once communicated his discovery to the proper authorities in Berlin, and in the year 1871 had the pleasure of receiving Professor E. Curtius, accompanied by Professor Adler, the architect, and Professor Gelzer, at Dikeli, the port of Pergamon, and conducting them to the Acropolis, where he showed them the indications of the buried treasure. In the same year he received a visit from Dr. Hirschfeld, the first director of the excavations at Olympia.

As the testimony of these high authorities left no doubt of the vast importance of the discovery, the Prussian Government would have been easily induced to commence operations at once, had they not been already engaged in the costly excavations in the Altis of Olympia, for which the Prussian Parliament, at a time when money was scarce, cheerfully voted above forty thousand pounds. The expedition to Pergamon was therefore deferred, and the

(1) xiii. 624.

(2) The splendid library of Pergamon was afterwards sent by Antony to Alexandria as a present to Cleopatra; an inappropriate gift to one who would have preferred a selection of modern French novels.

matter kept as secret as possible by the Germans, because they feared to be forestalled by the English, who seemed to them to have prerogative rights in Asia Minor. They little knew how vain were their fears of the rivalry of English Governments of the present day in such a field.

Yet even before the conclusion of their artistic campaign in the sacred plains of Elis, the Prussians found both suitable men and sufficient money to begin operations in Pergamon. In April of the following year, 1880, Professor Conze, the learned Director of the Royal Museum at Berlin, arrived in Pergamon, with full powers, accompanied by Mr. C. Wilberg, the artist, who, during his four weeks' sojourn, made a large number of interesting sketches of the Altar and the surrounding country.

The first excavations were made on a platform on the south-west side of the Acropolis, a little below its summit, which proved to be the site of the great Altar. This vast edifice, which must have presented a magnificent object of view from the city, is incidentally mentioned by Pausanias.¹ When speaking of the altar of Zeus at Olympia, he remarks that it consisted of the ashes of burnt victims "*like the altar of Pergamon.*" Another reference to the same building, which though quoted by C. O. Müller, and Bötticher, had attracted little notice, now assumed considerable importance. The passage is found in Ampelius, an obscure writer of the third century of our era, who says that "*there was at Pergamon a great altar of marble, 40 feet in height, with very large sculptures representing the Battle of the Gods and Giants.*"²

The success which attended the excavations on this platform was unprecedentedly great and rapid. The first ground was broken in September, 1879. In the month of June, 1880, 462 chests, weighing about 7,000 cwt., arrived safely in Berlin, containing 94 large slabs of the Gigantomachia (about three-fifths of the whole frieze), 35 slabs of the smaller frieze with the Telephus reliefs, 130 inscriptions, 37 statues, busts, horses, &c., and a vast number of architectural and other fragments.³

The observations of the able and indefatigable architect, Mr. R. Bohn, have established the fact that the proper altar of sacrifice rose, *sub Jove*, from about the centre (though somewhat nearer the N. side) of a vast basement of solid masonry, about 16 feet in height, and 100 feet square. This altar, which consisted of the piled-up ashes of burnt victims, was approached by a broad flight of steps cut in the basement, probably on the S. side. There are also strong

(1) v. 13, 8.

(2) Ampelii Lib. memorialis (miracula mundi); "*Pergamo erat ara marmorea magna, alta pedes quadraginta, cum maximis sculpturis; continet autem gigantomachiam.*"

(3) *Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen zu Pergamon.* Berlin, 1880.

reasons for believing that the altar was surrounded by a hall of elegant Ionic pillars, open towards the outside, but closed on the inner side by a wall, so as to form an enclosed space about the altar of 70 feet square, which could only be entered by the steps on the S. The principal frieze, representing the "Battle of the Gods and Giants," ran around all four sides of the building, at about 8 feet from the ground, except, of course, where it was interrupted by the flight of steps, up the sides of which it was continued in triangular form. The figures in the frieze, which, like the basement itself, is of a coarse-grained marble of a greyish light-blue tint, are about $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet high, and appear to have been carved on the slabs after the erection of the building. The smaller frieze, the subject of which is taken from the legend of Telephus, son of Herakles and Auge, is about $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 feet high, and was fixed in the wall of the Ionic hall surrounding the altar of sacrifice.

The great frieze of *The Gigantomachia*, the figures of which are in as high relief as those of a metope, was protected by a far-projecting cornice, in the cymatium of which the names of the contending Gods are inscribed. Below the frieze were the names of the Giants, and still lower those of the artists employed on the work. Of Gods, the following names may be still deciphered—'Αθηνᾶ, 'Ηρακλῆς, 'Αμφιτρίτη, Ποσειδῶν, 'Ωκεανός, Τρίτων, Ἄρης ('Ε)νύω, Αφροδίτη, Διώνη, Λη(τ)ώ, Θέμις, (Ασ)τερίη, and Γῆ. Of Giants, only three names are found complete—Χθονόφυλος, Ερυσίχθων, and 'Οχθαίο(ς); and of artists, not one is legible.

The subject was indeed one which must naturally recur again and again to the successive actors in the internecine struggles with the Gallic barbarians. Nothing could be more natural to the Greek mind than to represent the contest between Hellenic civilisation and enlightenment and Gallic ignorance and barbarism, by the old legend of the battle between the bright and beautiful Olympian Gods and the wild and lawless Giants, roughly shapen in nature's earliest and rudest mould.¹

Both Greeks and Romans were apt to regard the northern barbarians as a race of giants. Cullimachus,² the Alexandrian poet, who was alive when Attalus I. beat the Gauls, calls them "*late born Titans from the far west*." It was the vast size of the Germans which terrified the soldiers of Cæsar, and made many of his officers weep in their tents and apply for leave of absence in consequence of "urgent affairs" at Rome.

The nature of the contest between God and Giant and Hellene and

(1) Representations of the Gigantomachia are very numerous in ancient art: e.g. in the pediments of the Temple of Zeus at Agrigentum, and the Treasury of the Megarians at Olympia; in the Solunian metopes; on the peplos and shield of Athene, at Athens; and on ancient vases.

(2) "Del.," 174. 'Οψιγόνου Τιτῆνες ἀφ' Ἑσπέρου ἰσχατόντος.

Gaul was remarkably similar. In both cases, the utter destruction of the foe was the mutual object; all ideas of fairness and mercy were out of place. For God and Giant there was no alternative but Heaven and Hades, and for Hellene and Gaul no resting-place between dominion and death. The designer of the frieze has followed the myth in its later form as we find it in the pages of the mythographer, Apollodorus (140 B.C.) and the "Gigantomachia" of the poet Claudian. Homer knows nothing of a battle of Gods and Giants. The latter are mentioned once in the *Odyssey*,¹ in connection with the Cyclopes, as an insolent and lawless tribe, whom Eurymedon, an ancestor of Alcinous, "ruled over and destroyed," and as nearly related to the Phæacians. But though they are said to be kinsmen of the gods, they are always spoken of by Homer as mortals.² Hesiod,³ on the other hand, regards them as divine beings born of Ge. The mighty Mother Earth, in her ceaseless struggle with Heaven (*Ouranos*), had led her brood of Titans against the bright citadels of the Gods, and had suffered a terrible defeat. Prometheus was chained to the rock of Caucasus; the proud neck of Atlas was bowed beneath the superincumbent world; and the flesh of Tityos grew only to be devoured. She now creates a new race of monsters from the blood of the mutilated Kronos (or from intercourse with Tartarus) and hurls them once more on her ancient foes.⁴

The hosts of Heaven and Hades confronted each other.

"Jam tuba nimborum sonuit, jam signa ruendi
His Aether his Terra dedit."

Ge herself is thinking of her Titan children and her own humiliation.

"Solvite Titanas vinclis, defendito matrem."

But she promises them the plunder of the universe.

"* * * Praestat victoria mundum,
* * * * * Alter habenas
Auroræ pro Sole regat, te Delphica laurus
Stringat Porphyryon."

Fired by every passion which could rouse their savage natures to madness—the hope of vengeance, empire, and the possession of the Olympian Goddesses, whose beauty had so often led their elder brethren to ruin—they rush with eager confidence to the fight.

"Jam credunt vicisse Deos * * *

Hic sternere Martem,
Cogitat, hic Phoebi laceros divellere crines

(1) vii. 207; Conf. x. 120.

(2) Pausan., viii. 29, 2. "Ἐν τε οὖν τούτοις ἐηλοῖ (*"Ομηρος*) θνητοὺς ὄντας καὶ οὐθεῖον γένος τοὺς Τιγαντας.

(3) *Theog.* 185.

(4) There was, after all, no great presumption in this. Ge, as the Daughter of Chaos (*Hesiod Theog.* 117, 126) was better born than Zeus, and even in her fallen estate she looked with a certain St. Germain contempt on the Olympian dynasty.

Hic sibi promittit Venorem, spiratque Dianæ
 Conjugium, castamque cupit violare Minervam."¹

In such a spirit is the frieze of the great altar of Pergamon conceived. It represents in Homeric fashion a series of hand-to-hand contests between God and Giant, or a contest over the corpses of the slain.

The figures, which are of colossal size, about $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet in height, are executed in the freest and boldest style, and in such high relief that they have all the effect of statues. The artist has given full play to a wild and daring fancy, and the skilful hand seems to embody with inexhaustible skill and genial ease the most eccentric vagaries of his bold imagination. The form and attitude of the Gods, of course, are dignified and graceful; but in those of the Giants we find the utmost variety and originality of conception. Some of them are of the noblest type of vigorous youth and of mature and dignified manhood, and can hardly be distinguished from their adversaries. In others the thighs are prolonged into hideous serpents,² which with their strong coils and venomous bite take an active part in the engagement. Many of them have wings, either two or four; one has the head and paws of a lion, another a human trunk, and another the horns and ears of a Triton; another monster, in shaping which the artist has done his utmost in the direction of ugliness, has a hump on his neck like a buffalo.

The chief groups which probably occupied the E. side of the Altar are those in which Athênê and Zeus are engaged. We begin with the latter, although the first place belongs of right to the former as tutelary divinity of the Acropolis to whom the Altar was dedicated.

Zeus, the great king and leader of the Gods, is engaged, like the foremost Greeks in the *Iliad*, with several foes at once. With resistless might he strides over the bodies of the fallen, shaking the dread ægis in his raised right hand. On his right is a Giant sitting on the ground whose thigh is transfixed by a flaming thunderbolt. On his left is another young Giant in human form upon his knees with his hand to his wounded shoulder. To the left again is an enormous snake-legged monster, who has wrapped a hide—his only garment—about his arm by way of shield, and undismayed by the fate of his comrades is hurling a rock at the omnipotent Thunderer.³ Above him rise the heads of his snake-legs, into the jaws of which the attendant eagle of *Zeus*, swooping from above, has fixed his iron claws. The remains of a magnificent quadriga, bearing a driver in long fluttering garments and with a shield, probably belong to this group. The fiery and winged horses with a bar across their backs, like that of our old curricule, are wildly rushing over a heap of dead.

(1) *Claudiani Gigantomachia*. Conf. Ovid. *Met.* i. 167.

(2) *Apollodor.* i. 6, 1, εἶχον δὲ τὰς βάσεις φοιτῶντας δρακόντων.

(3) This extraordinary figure is the more interesting because it is closely copied in a well-known Roman relief in the Vatican.

The centre of interest, however, is in the scene which contains *Athéné*. She is purposely, perhaps, represented without any weapon of offence, except the dread gorgoneion on her breast—

“Non utitur hasta
Nam satis est vidisse semel.”

Seizing a handsome Giant with four wings by the hair she strives to drag him along in her onward course. Her constant attendant, the Erichthonian serpent, has coiled round his right leg and left arm and forced him into a position so similar to that of Laocoon in the Vatican, that many persons believe that the *motif* of the latter was borrowed from the Pergamenian relief. The pathetic hopeless expression in the upturned face of the paralyzed Giant is very powerfully rendered. On the right side of the slab a Nike with outspread wings, which balance those of the Giant in this masterly composition, floats towards the Goddess with the garland of victory. Before her feet is the mighty form of *Ge*, half emerging from the ground, and with piteous look supplicating mercy for her monstrous brood

“Injuncta monstribus Terra dolet suis.”

Although but little certainty has been as yet arrived at in the arrangement of the different slabs of this vast relief, the Berlin authorities are probably right in bringing the cognate deities Hecatê, Artemis, and Apollo into close proximity in the south-east corner of the altar.

Most of the types of the Gods in the relief are familiar to our eyes, but the figure of *Hecatê* is without precedent in ancient art. She is represented with three heads, a triple body, and six arms, three of which bear shields and a sword-sheath, while the right hands are armed with sword, and spear, and a long flaming torch which she is driving like a lance into the faces of her enemies. She is vigorously seconded by her dog, who is fixing his great fangs into the body of a prostrate Giant. Above the dog is the head of a snake furiously biting into the rim of Hecatê's shield. On the next slab to the right we recognise *Artemis*, who, with one foot firmly planted on the scaly legs of a fallen Giant, is drawing her bow against a young and handsome Giant with shield and helmet, who rushes on to meet her. He is hastening to the assistance of his older comrade on whom Artemis is treading, while one of her dogs seizes the back of his neck between its teeth.

One of the most beautiful figures is supposed to be *Apollo*, who is standing over the body of a fallen foe, in the act of drawing another deadly arrow from his quiver. Opposed to him is a snake-legged monster who has wrapped his skin garment round his arm by way of shield.

Another form of great beauty is that of *Dionysos* wearing an ivy

crown, and a short rich garment girt with the skin of a wild beast. He is accompanied by his favourite panther and two young Satyrs, who are easily recognised by their coarse bristling hair and the goat glands in their necks. The group reminds us of a passage in Eratosthenes,¹ in which he says that Dionysos (and Hephaistos) and the Satyrs rode to battle with the Giants on asses, and frightened the enemy by their cries.

We know from the inscription mentioned above that the *Marine Deities*, Poseidon, Okeanos, Triton, &c., played an important part in the battle, but we have no certain representation of any particular God, except perhaps Amphitrite in the slab marked Z².² There is reason to believe that they occupied the sides of the flight of steps leading up to the altar of sacrifice. We have, however, a magnificent *Biga of Hippocamps*, which can only have belonged to Poseidon, and several combatants on the side of the Gods, bearing evident signs of their watery origin. One of these wears a high cap of fish skin; another fantastic monster, a sort of sea-centaur, has the forehead of a horse, the head and body of a man down to the hips, with wings of sea-weed feathers, and a long curling fish tail. Another has a human form, with the addition of wings, short horns and pointed ears, which end in sea-weed, with which the feathers of his wings are also interspersed.

One of the most imposing groups is composed of a well-preserved quadriga, driven by a God (Helios?) or king, clad in the typical garment of the Greek charioteer. He holds the reins in his left hand and swings a torch in his right. The progress of the rearing horses is checked by a Giant who has boldly thrown himself in their way. A female figure on horseback, supposed to be *Eos* (Aurora) is thus cut off from the chariot which she had preceded. She turns her head towards the Giant in terror and gallops away. There is another female rider in the frieze with her back turned to the spectator who is generally called *Selênê*. One might object that these Goddesses are not accustomed to ride. *Eos* is generally winged and floats before the Sun-god, and *Selênê* either drives or walks.

The face of the so-called *Helios* is too much mutilated to show whether it is a portrait or not. Either Attalus or Eumenes would certainly occupy a prominent place in the composition, and it would be in accordance with the presumptuous practice of Alexander and his successors to represent the ruler of Pergamon as the Sun god in his chariot. The band round the head of this figure reminds us of the coins of Hiero II. of Syracuse.

As pendant to Ge, the mother of the Giants, we find another slab bearing the stately form of *Cybele* (Rhea), "the great Mother" of the

(1) *Catast.* ii.

(2) In the Assyrian Hall of the Berlin Museum.

Gods. The chief seat of this venerable Goddess was in the neighbouring Phrygian mountains, from one of which, Κυβέλα, near Celaenae, she took her name; and her worship and that of her satellites the Cabeiri had existed in Pergamon from the very earliest times. As Mother of the Gods she is represented in very full proportions, and she enters the contest riding as usual on a lion. Her ample mantle covers her head as well as her body, thus giving her the appropriate air of sanctity and mystery. Above her head floats the eagle of her son Zeus, bearing in his claws a thunderbolt bound with sacred fillets. Her weapon is a bow which is not elsewhere ascribed to her, and she is in the act of drawing an arrow from her quiver. She is preceded, as a mark of her great dignity, first by a female attendant, whose garment swells like a sail behind her back, and further to the front by the rude and powerful form of one of the Cabeiri who belonged to her train.¹ He carries his proper attribute, the hammer, which he is aiming with both hands at the most monstrous form in the composition.

This is a Giant who has not only the usual serpent-legs, but the hump and ears of a buffalo. He has thrown his huge bulk on an enemy who drives his sword up to the hilt into the monster's body.

The chief enigma in the frieze is a beautiful female figure, whom the Germans call by the wonderful name of *Schlangentopfererin*. Dressed in a chiton, and with a mantle over her shoulders, she is striding to the left to attack a Giant who has fallen on one knee. She seizes his shield with her left hand and attempts to drag it away, and her right hand holds a round vase encircled by serpents which she is about to hurl at him. She wears a short fluttering veil, and her hair is confined by a simple band. The beauty of her face and her rich garments have procured for her the name of *Aphrodite*; others see in her a *Nereid*, but the riddle of her attribute remains unsolved. This figure is the more interesting because four or five female figures, hurling similar vases, but not encircled by serpents, are found in a Gigantomachia by Giulio Romano in the Palazzo del Te, near Mantua. If we accept the name of *Aphrodite*, which I am hardly inclined to do, the utter inadequacy of her brittle weapon against such foes would suggest to our minds the words of Claudian.²

Κύπρις δ' οὔτε βέλος φέρεν οὐθ' ὄπλον, ἀλλ' ἐκόμιζεν
Ἀγλαίην.

Of one combatant on the side of the Gods, as essential to every Gigantomachia as Zeus himself, viz. *Herakles*, no certain traces have as yet been found. There is indeed the fragment of a male figure with the typical lion's skin and club, but it is probably that of a Giant attacking a lion to his left. If so, *Herakles* must

1) Diodor. v. 51. Lucian Dea Syr. xv. 97.

2) Fragm. translated from the Latin.

have been represented in another part of the frieze. With that strange inconsistency which pervades the whole Greek mythology, the success of the immortal and omnipotent Gods was made contingent by a higher law, promulgated through the oracles, on the presence and assistance of a mortal. Τοῖς δὲ Θεοῖς λόγιον ἦν ὑπὸ Θεῶν μὲν μῖθονα τῶν, Γυγάντων ἀπολέσθαι δύνασθαι, συμμαχοῦντος δὲ θνητῶν τινός, τελευτήσειν. Ἡρακλέα οὖν σύμμαχον Ζεὺς εἰ Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπικαλέσατο.¹ And in fact Herakles was the hero of the battle, for it was he who slew with his bow the two most formidable Giants, Alcyoneus and Porphyrion,² who appear to have alarmed even Zeus himself.

Throughout the whole frieze the Gods of course have the upper hand. But they have no easy task, and in one or two cases a God appears to be in peril. It is only the *Goddesses*—of whom there are some sixteen—who are never in trouble or danger. The calmness and cheerfulness with which they thrust their blazing torches into the faces of the howling Giants, and tread with those beautiful boots on their upturned faces, are wonderful to behold!

Our object in the foregoing sketch has been principally descriptive, and we have little space for criticism. But the reader will have gathered from what has been said that the work has all the characteristics of the period to which it belongs—the colossal grandeur, the violence, the grotesqueness, the pathos, the wild fancy, the rhetorical exaggeration, the *bravura* tones of the Alexandrian age. The first effect is extremely striking, almost overpowering, but it is hardly elevating or ennobling. Many of the forms are moulded on the best Greek models, and the execution is not only highly skilful but conscientiously carried out in those parts of the composition which are hidden from the eye. But there is much in these reliefs that is anything but Greek, that is barbarous and Asiatic; much which reminds us more of the bloody Roman arena than the Olympian Altis. I am not sure that they would gain by a long acquaintance. I doubt whether—as is the case with the highest Greek work—we could look at them again and again during our whole lives, and always discover some new beauty, some new idea, always gain a deeper insight into the heart and soul of the artist, and into that infinite and ideal world from which he drew his inspirations.

The second smaller Frieze, of which from thirty to forty slabs have been discovered, appears to have adorned the inner wall of the Ionic colonnade which enclosed the altar of burnt ashes. The subject of the reliefs is taken from the legend of Telephus, son of Auge, an Arcadian princess, who was subjected to the violent wooing of

(1) Apollodor. i. 6.

(2) Pindar Pyth. viii. 19, 25.

(2) Καὶ δὲ ποτὲ εἰς Πορφυρίων αὐτῷ (Jovi) παρίσχετο πρᾶγματα. Schol. Aristoph. Av. 1251. Conf. Hor. Carm. ii. 12, 7, and iii. 4, 49.

Herakles while acting as priestess of Athênê. An oracle of the second century B.C. addresses the Pergamenians as *Telephidae*,¹ and they always claimed descent from an Arcadian colony which came to Mysia under the leadership of Telephus, to whom they paid divine honours. The unhappy Auge exposed her child in the mountains of Arcadia, where he was suckled by a hind. Mother and child were subsequently found by Herakles, and saved from destruction. They were afterwards wrecked on the coast of Teuthrania, where Auge became the wife of King Teuthras, and Telephus leader of the Teuthranians. He opposed the landing of the Greeks on their way to Troy, and was wounded by the spear of Achilles. On consulting the oracle he was told that the wound could only be healed by the rust of the spear which inflicted it. Telephus, therefore, steals into the house of Agamemnon, seizes the little Orestes, takes refuge at the domestic altar, and extorts the healing rust from the parents by threatening the life of the child. All these scenes appear to be portrayed in the remains of the frieze. On one of the slabs at Berlin we see Telephus seated on the altar, with a bandage round his wounded leg, holding the infant Orestes. The terrified nurse is kneeling on the altar steps, and above her is a fragment of Agamemnon holding a sceptre. On another slab Herakles is standing before a plane-tree with club and lion's skin, and the infant Telephos is playing on the ground at the dugs of some feline animal. On another, Auge is represented completely enveloped in a mantle which covers the back of her head, sitting on an eminence in evident sorrow. Below her are two men preparing a boat, which they move with curious machines. In the most perfectly preserved relief, we see another woman (nymph ?) sitting, also wrapped in a hooded mantle, and below her a woman (slave), who is feeding the fire under a caldron with billets of wood.

The whole tone of the Telephus frieze is quieter, and therefore more Greek than that of the Gigantomachia, and serves to show how eclectic in character was the art of the Diadochi.

It is as yet perhaps too early to form a final judgment on the significance and merit of these interesting remains; but as they are being made the subject of enthusiastic study by the great archaeologists at Berlin, we may confidently expect that more light will be thrown upon the subject. The study of the reliefs will soon be made easier and more general by the multiplication of careful casts at Berlin, which will take their proper place in the museums of every country in Europe, except England, which alone has no scientific gallery of casts.

WALTER C. PERRY.

(1) Karbel, *Epigram. Graeca* n. 1035, and Conze *Ergebnisse der Ausgrab. zu Pergamon*, p. 66.

A VOLUME OF FRENCH SOUVENIRS.¹

MADAME JAUBERT was fortunate enough, and was fully worthy of her fortune, to be intimate with many eminent men and many interesting women. She has been the Egeria of many a talent, she has been the confidante of many an amour, she has known closely much of that which was best in her land and time. A leader of fashion, she has lived in that world of culture and of varied gifts to which fashion is but an outside wrapper ; she belongs of birthright to the aristocracy of intelligence and of manners. The years of enjoyment and of excitement fly quickly past : then comes the calm time of reminiscences become tender, and of memories become sacred. Happy they who have, as Madame Jaubert has, the enviable gift of recording through literature, and recording with incisive and yet most delicate talent, the recollections of a memorable past. We have to thank her for one of the brightest and pleasantest books of its sort that exists in the department of *mémoire* and *souvenir*.

The one defect of the book is, that it contains no letters from Madame Jaubert herself. For certainly, Madame Jaubert herself interests us almost more than any one of the fair ladies that she paints so well. Our authoress never seeks to obtrude, or to depict herself, but she yet succeeds in revealing to us a very charming personality, and this revelation is given, in part, by means of reflected lights ; by the allusions to her made by others. She appears clearly for a moment, and then vanishes from our sight. Her art is so subtle that we lose ourselves in its results, and are apt to think too little of the fair artist herself. We guess at her relations to her admirers—every man that knew her was her admirer—but the wise reader does not seek to lessen an illusion by knowing too much. We find ourselves in an atmosphere in which we leave all things to the sweep of a fancy which scorns the pedantry of exactitude, and never seeks to penetrate to the hardness of actual fact. We soon feel in Madame Jaubert's work the presence of a refined reticence and an exquisite discretion. She triumphs in omission as she succeeds in revelation. She does not paint others, or indicate herself, by surface insistence, but rather through an undercurrent of latent suggestion. Madame Jaubert has the art of conveying a meaning without precisely stating it ; we know without knowing that we know, and how we know ; or even what we know. She speaks of

(1) *Souvenirs de Madame C. Jaubert, Lettres et Correspondances*. Paris: J. Hetzel et Cie., Editeurs.

her rôle d'*accompagnateur*; but she accompanies as a good musician accompanies a pupil. She says once, *mais je ne saurais m'expliquer d'avantage*. She is no longer young; but those who read her with an insight which they may catch from her, can do justice to her in her youth. Full of heart and vivacity, witty, tender, intelligent, sympathetic, she has been one to whom men—even such a man as De Musset—could tell everything. So fine was her tact, that women confided in her; nay, men, when chasing two hares, could make her a *confidante*, as Esmond did Lady Castlewood when he was in love with Beatrix. Madame Jaubert realises all Lord Beaconsfield's ideal of the power of women to help men and men's careers. Surrounded by gay, bright, quick-witted—sometimes by shallow and frivolous—men and women, she seems a typical woman of that brilliant society of France in which women have always played so important a part on the *chemin vicinal de l'amour et l'amitié*. For France has its De Lauzun, but not its Sidney; has its sparkling coquettes, but never an Imogen. Among all the personages that fill—but do not crowd—the canvas of Madame Jaubert, two figures stand out distinctly; and they are, *l'amante et l'amoureux*. The influence of nationality on manners, on tones of thought, on forms of life, is great as it is obvious; and in nothing is this very different-charactered influence more strongly shown than it is in the relations between the sexes. Madame Jaubert's book transports us emphatically to France. We live amongst men and women who live amongst each other in a way that is not ours. In writing for English readers one may leave England out of the question; but it is curious to contrast German sentimentalism and romance with French sentiment and coquetry. Frenchmen are like those old Pagans who took the pleasures of life boldly, and were not restrained by conscience from cultivating and enjoying pleasure to the full.

This book, which is a true picture of French life, contains so much love-making, and so little love. The intrigue is ceaseless, the *liaisons* ever changing. It is a life of sustained gallantry, with exaltation, but without strain; there is no hint of the relations of man to woman “when they love their closest and their best.” While his passion lasts, the lover may, as a *façon de parler*, speak of eternity while enjoying the fleeting hour, and thinking—if thinking at all—of future intrigues. There is no *ténacité fatigante*. French lovers prove *wie leicht sich's leben lässt*, and their attachment is intense in proportion to a sense of transiency and mutability. There is no question of morals. An actor and actress may play love delightfully, and you are charmed with the illusion; but you know, if you care to think of it, that they are not really in love with each other. French amours, like straw on fire, burn brightly for a brief space, and then the flame ceases of itself. Between French and English women there is

the difference that there is between the women of Molière and of Shakspeare. Love in France, in such circles as Madame Jaubert depicts, is an elegant comedy, but it is seldom noble, and never earnest. "A lover may bestride the gossamer that idles in the wanton summer air, and yet not fall, so light is vanity." A French lover requires for his vanity a lighter film than gossamer. Olivia asks Viola, "What shall you ask of me that I'll deny, that honour saved may upon asking give?" A French audience would hardly understand Olivia, because a French Olivia would have married Orsino, and taken on Cesario as a lover.

The first portrait in Madame Jaubert's gallery is that of Berryer—the legitimist politician, the able advocate, the admired orator. Berryer is an imposing figure, and shines with a certain sham grandeur. Vehement and impassioned, he is perpetually engaged in some love intrigue. *Ce qui plaît aux femmes dans l'amour, c'est le spectacle de la force vaincue*; and Berryer was a man of force and might. Madame Jaubert paints her orator in his country-house, in holiday-time, in summer. He is happily married, and brings round him, in his elegant home, a bright circle of celebrities and of beauties. The reigning queen of the hour (also in the house) is a certain Comtesse de T——, who *tenait grande place dans l'existence de Berryer*. It had become, as Madame Berryer explains to Madame Jaubert, *une passion à grand orchestre*. Madame Berryer was her husband's ally and friend. *Un attachement solide succéda entre nous à l'amour*. Berryer could hide nothing from his wife.

Madame Berryer does not interrogate her husband about his affairs of the heart; but, during his sleep, she took hold of his hand, and he confessed everything to a friend *incapable d'abuser*. Time at the Château d'Augerville passed pleasantly in *bonnes causeries, et en promenades, que l'on altérât avec la musique*, and then there was a brilliant drama of coquetry to study and to watch. *En tout il y a de la mode*, observes Madame Berryer: and the Comtesse de T—— confides fully in Madame Jaubert.

Berryer had, at one time, an idea of taking holy orders; but, characteristically, *il caressait alors en imagination les succès de la chaire*: and he expected to gain, by means of eloquence, *une influence persistante sur ce sexe toujours aimé*. He loved music and the theatre, but had no feeling for painting. With constant vivacity, but without effort, Madame Jaubert paints for us, with delicate feminine observation, and in her happy idiom, the great orator, his country life, his house, his guests, his love. She succeeds in giving a reflected impression of the great advocate's eloquence; but she says, happily, *ce n'est pas avec tout le monde que l'on peut être éloquent*!

We come next to the brilliant romantic poet of French youth and love, Alfred de Musset. This is no occasion in which to speak

of his writings; it is with the personality of De Musset that we have to do; and the many original letters from the poet which Madame Jaubert's correspondence contains do not tend to increase our love for the man. For his *chère marraine*, Madame Jaubert herself, De Musset avows a warm *sentiment sans nom*; and to her he certainly writes freely, confidentially, unreservedly. A man so full of egotism must paint himself in his frank letters; and no memoir of De Musset contains a more complete revelation of the man, or of that morbid *Ego* which was unendurable even to its possessor. Like a tall lily with a feeble stem, the poet is made up of height and weakness. His tone is bitter rather than sad. Love plays a great part in his correspondence, but we never feel the beat of a heart or the touch of a conscience. He is sore with excoriated vanity; he quivers petulantly with nervous irritability and with a morbid sensitiveness to ridicule. His letters are full of *plaisanteries*, of malice and of wit; but they also reveal his pride, timidity, and tormenting self-consciousness. They gleam with a sombre brightness, like that of dead gold. There is a strain of Rousseau in his nature; of that Rousseau of whom it is written, "when the days began to turn the summer was straightway at an end for him; 'my imagination,' he said, 'at once brings winter;'" and De Musset says truly of himself—*je ne suis pas tendre, mais je suis excessif*. His life was full of intrigues, but it may be doubted whether he ever felt, or was capable of feeling love. He writes, with contempt, of *cette pauvre Madame Sand*, and speaks of hanging verses, intended for another lady, *sur le tombeau de Rachel*. His passions, while they lasted, were full of feverish excitement, but, after a time, *la raison se fait entendre*, and he is off with the old love and on with the new. He had vanity, but no pride; and his character is strangely wanting in dignity and self-respect. He was not incapable of the baseness of *la vendetta poétique*. He was not a convert to Berryer's maxim, *qu'il faut tendre à s'aimer confortablement*; and all De Musset's amours were strained, morbid, uneasy, fleeting.

Of the *Princesse Belgiojoso*, Madame Jaubert says, in her epigrammatic way,—*Aux yeux de la Princesse, les hommes formaient une seule et vaste catégorie, divisée en trois séries amoureuses—il l'est, le fut, ou le doit être*; and for some time De Musset *le fut*. The well-known lines *Sur une morte* were intended for the Princess, and the publication of such an attack naturally aroused great indignation among the lady's many friends. De Musset maintained that he thought the lines would be understood only by the Princess; the Princess maintained that she alone never read them—an assertion which elicited an outburst of savage incredulity from the poetic ex-lover. *Sur une morte* appeared in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, in 1842. When his vanity was wounded, De Musset was ruthless towards

women, and he describes himself as a man *qui peut se redresser si on lui marche sur la gêne*.

He himself says of *Sur une morte*, that he sincerely regretted his verses. *C'est mal, c'est absurde, non pas de les avoir faits, mais de les avoir imprimés*. On his relations, and his rupture with George Sand, Madame Jaubert throws no new light: indeed, more light was not needed, since the facts are very well known. He drifted apart from *paucere Paulinette*, while admitting that she was *charmante, pleine d'âme, plus distinguée cent fois que tous ces brailards-là*; and the lady revolted his fine taste by marrying. Of his breach with the Princess he writes, *Ce sera la seconde édition de mon histoire avec Rachel, que j'ai plantée là par mauvaise humeur, sans aucune raison valable; laquelle Rachel s'est piquée, a voulu dire quelle m'avait planté là la première, lequel moi me suis fâché tout rouge, lettres échangées, tapage, crialleries et finalement eau de boudin*. The records of "love" contain, happily, few such confessions. He made a strong caricature of the Princess and let it be shown about at a party at her house; and he did even worse than that. Meeting at her house a certain beautiful Mdlle. de C——, he devoted himself ostentatiously to the young lady, danced with her, and made love to her before the jealous eyes of the hostess, whose Italian fervour glowed through French levity. He took it into his head to fall violently in love with Mdlle. de C——. He followed his charmer in hot haste to the country. As he never would tell the history of this journey, even to Madame Jaubert, it may with certainty be assumed that his suit was not successful. *Personne n'est plus faible, plus tergiversant, et plus poule mouillée, que votre indécorable filleul*, he writes. *Le serpent n'allait pas en Normandie chercher des pommes*, replies Madame Jaubert; and De Musset exclaims, rapturously, *Je vous défie vous-même d'avoir plus d'esprit que ce mot-là. Dites donc! comme c'est gentil, vous!*

After all these injuries the poet dared to approach the Princess, and to address her in his usual tone; but the justly offended great lady, on her part, *elle lui répondit avec une distraction dont il sentit l'impertinence voulue*. So ends another passion; though De Musset long felt enraged against a woman who returned scorn for his infidelities and insults. He loved her, as he understood love, after the irreparable breach; and perhaps Madame Jaubert, had she seen fit to do so, might have brought princess and poet together in the old relations.

In so far as he was capable of unselfish affection, De Musset probably felt a sincere tenderness for Madame Jaubert, his kind, pitying, sympathizing *confidante*. So far as he himself knows himself, he bares his whole mind to her. His letters to her are in a *mezzo caractère de gaieté et de sentiment*. He was as much attached to her as he could be to any one except himself. Society and women spoiled

him ; and to his misfortune, his character was enervated by too easy successes.

Everybody will be sensible of a great change when we turn from Alfred de Musset to Pierre Lanfrey. Lanfrey has more "character" than any of Madame Jaubert's other correspondents, and we are in the presence of a virile understanding and a clear will. Lanfrey is proud, self-reliant, energetic, conscious of his own powers, and of working hard in grave labours to unfold them. To him also Madame Jaubert was a *marraine*, and she christened him *Ferocino*—a name which he adopted, and uses playfully as a signature when writing to his witty correspondent. Like all men of fine natures, he was fond of the society of women ; but, though he loved women, he shrank from marriage. He, too, had his "successes ;" but there was method in his madness, and when the air around a passion became oppressive, or threatened his work, he fled from the coming storm. He was never like De Musset, "passion's slave." There is something staid and earnest about Lanfrey, and it is a little difficult to apply to him De Musset's lines :—

"Le père ouvre la porte au matériel époux
Mais toujours l'idéal entre par la fenêtre."

He retained always a pure and noble affection for his old mother.

It would seem that publishers on the other side of the channel are not always considerate or courteous towards authors. *Patience, vertu des ânes!* exclaimed fiery Mirabeau ; and Lanfrey had but little patience with discourtesy. He was haughtily intolerant of all the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes. He resented an indignity with indignation ; and Madame Jaubert records further of him—*le côté commercial lui était antipathique, lui échappait*. When the historian of Napoleon I. was an unknown writer, he sought a publisher for his first volumes ; and his adventures are thus characteristically related :—

"Depuis quinze jours je fais le métier le plus infernal auquel un homme qui se respecte puisse être soumis : celle de solliciteur. Je sue tout le sang que je tiens de mon père et de vous, sang indépendant et généreux s'il en fut, et qui s'indigne de cette humiliation, nouvelle pour lui. Voici le commerce récréatif auquel je me livre—Je me présente en grande tenue chez un éditeur, c'est à dire la plupart du temps un butor sans instinct ou sans éducation, poli tout juste : puis je déclare l'objet de ma visite. Il regarde ma mine, et comme j'ai l'air beaucoup plus jeune encore que je ne suis, il sourit d'un air obligeant, puis me répond qu'il serait extrêmement flatté de publier mon ouvrage s'il n'imprimait pas dans ce moment même un travail de M—— sur le même sujet. Là-dessus je lui tire ma révérence, d'un air aussi impertinent que possible, et lui me reconduit jusqu'à la porte avec de grandes salutations ironiques."

After several failures, he obtained a good introduction to the publisher Pagnerre, who asked for a little time to consider the manuscript. After allowing twelve days to elapse, Lanfrey calls, and is

told that Pagnerre has not yet had time to open the parcel. Lanfrey demands the return of his manuscript.

Eventually, he published the early volumes of his great work at his own risk and expense. The success was enormous and deserved. Thiers said to Lanfrey: *Ah, mon cher! si je vous avais connu quand j'ai écrit mon histoire de Napoléon.* When he died, his sixth and last volume wanted fifty pages. In his will he instructs his executors to burn the imperfect manuscript, without even reading it; and his heroic directions were obeyed.

Madame Jaubert tells us that the *salon s'est éteint à la révolution de 1848*; but she continued the fine tradition in her *réunions intimes*; and Lanfrey was one of her honoured and favoured guests. He was attracted to her *par cette franc-maçonnerie qui existe entre les natures d'élite*; and he intrusts to her all his secret aspirations, his troubles and his hopes. Jealous of his independence he refused flattering overtures from all parties in France. An honest difference of political opinion made him decline the very advantageous offers of the *Journal des Débats*. He disliked Sainte-Beuve, and held Victor Hugo in contempt; but he had a strange fondness for cats. He would not give up his noon of manhood for a myrtle shade; nor would he lend his talents to any party. He became a power in French literature and politics. Madame Jaubert gives us pretty glimpses of his boyish struggles with the Jesuit fathers—of his first innocent romance of youthful love in Italy. When the Franco-Prussian war broke out, Lanfrey became a volunteer, a private in the forces of his own department, and suffered cold and hardship, besides being gnawed by a patriotic indignation. Lanfrey became a senator, and French ambassador at Berne, and plunged in his last years actively into politics. He died of lung disease at Pau, 16th November, 1877. Madame Jaubert sums the historian up by saying, *Sa religion fut le culte de l'honneur; entre toutes les religions, certes, la plus sévère et la plus exigeante. Avec l'honneur il n'est point d'accommodement!*

We come next to the last, the greatest, and, as respects his latter years, the saddest figure among Madame Jaubert's correspondents and intimates—Heinrich Heine. The German poet settled in Paris, where Madame Jaubert first met him at a ball in 1835. Her instinct was, to doubt his *bonté*, his goodness of heart; nor would it seem, in spite of her *bonté* towards him, that this feeling ever wholly disappeared. Of Heine's malice and vindictiveness Madame Jaubert saw many instances. He could also wrap bitterness in rudeness; and Heine lacked French fine tact. *Il n'avait pas toujours dans la conversation la légèreté d'être touché vraiment française; il ne savait pas lâcher au sujet, mais s'y obstinait.* He sneered at Victor Cousin as a *faux savant*, dressed up in plumes borrowed from Ger-

man philosophy. He played cruelly upon the superstitious fears of poor Bellini, the composer; he quarrelled bitterly with Meyerbeer, because the musician once neglected to send him a box at the opera; he called Béranger a *polisson*—and would not retract; he wrote some strong lines about his admiring friend, Madame de K——; and Madame Jaubert tried in vain to obtain the suppression of the more offensive ones. The poet objected, that the verses which Madame Jaubert wished to have excised were always the best! Heine became *eingefleischt* in Paris, but he retained marked traces of his race and of his nationality. There is more wild wit and mocking wisdom in his letters than in those of Alfred de Musset; but there is something stiff and strained in Heine's efforts at French *badinage* and ethereal levity. Heine's mind was a greater one than that of De Musset; but he is not so French. He was one of the most complex natures that ever existed. His poetical gift is often magical. He has, it is true, a pen which seems guided by Mephistopheles, and he has an ineradicable tendency to begin a statue of Apollo, and to complete it with the lower end of Pan. His character was like his work. He was malicious, sarcastic, depraved, humorous, witty, Pagan. *Pourtant il y a un coin du divin dans l'homme*; and Heine had this corner. *Ses propres malices le divertissaient fort*, says Madame Jaubert; he enjoyed the pain given by the exercise of his cruel wit. And yet he hid tenderly from his old Jewess mother in Hamburg the desperate state of his health!

We see the poet, in Paris, through the keen eyes of Madame Jaubert; and we become intimate with all the facts of his ill-starred marriage. His wife absolutely lives for us in these *Souvenirs*. He commenced by relations with a young and pretty *ouvrière* of Paris, one Juliette. They parted for months, owing to Heine's furious, if not groundless jealousy; and then they came together—*lequel des deux avait pardonné?*—and he married her. Madame Heine was pleasure-loving, like a Parisian girl of her class; and her lot as a wife was hard to bear. *Si Juliette n'était pas littéraire, elle avait en revanche un goût prononcé pour l'hippodrome et le théâtre*. One whispered confidence of Heine to Madame Jaubert is admirable—*Elle n'a jamais lu de moi; elle ne sait pas ce que c'est qu'un poète! Cependant j'ai découvert en elle, une vague idée que mon nom est imprimé dans une revue (et parlant plus bas encore) mais elle ne sait pas laquelle*.

There was a wonderful naiveté in the simple Juliette. One day, when Heine seemed likely to die in one of the cruel paroxysms of his terrible disorder, she cried—*Non, Henri, non, tu ne feras pas cela, tu ne mourras pas! tu auras pitié! j'ai déjà perdu mon perroquet ce matin: si tu mourrais, je serais trop malheureuse!*

Surely any sin—any crime even—must have been more than expiated by eight years of such cruel suffering as Heine underwent

and bore with the heroism of a martyr! The Holy Office itself could not have devised tortures more terrible or more protracted. Heine's intellect never failed him, and his courage never flagged. It is pitiful to read his grim banter upon his own sad condition: *J'ai dans ce moment un grand succès de moribond. Je mange des cœurs. Again, Je ne veux pas être enterré à Passy: le cimetière doit y être bien ennuyeux.* One has not the heart to transcribe any details of his long and horrible sufferings. *Que peut notre art (said Heine's doctor) luttant contre un amour insensé, une jalousie extravagante? le mariage était fatal: il a singulièrement hâté la marche de sa maladie.*

Madame Jaubert remarks to the doctor, *Mais cet homme est vraiment bon!* to which the doctor replied coldly, *Relativement; il faut se souvenir qu'il a l'esprit vindicatif. Sa bonté est restreinte, et gardons-nous de son inimitié.* By adducing this opinion Madame Jaubert endorses it. She saw him, for the last time, four days before his death. Actuated by the best intentions, doubtless, some ladies sent l'Abbé Caron to "convert" Heine. The only result was that, beside some other grim pleasantries, he ranks the Roman Catholic religion, *Comme bonne religion d'été, attendu la fraîcheur des églises.*

It is pleasant to think of the pleasure which the constant kindly visits of his "little fairy," of our Madame Jaubert, must have brought to the dreary mattress of the long-dying poet. *La passion,* she says, *qui l'a tué a été inspirée par cette fillette devenue sa femme.*

H. SCHÜTZ WILSON.

THE DRY BONES OF POPULAR EDUCATION.

DURING the last ten years a great deal of industry has been expended upon the production of books for the instruction of children in elementary schools. And though the results of this industry are of national importance, the work has been hitherto left to private enterprise, and has been carried on as an affair of speculation by book-makers and publishers. The Council of Education has carefully abstained from directing it authoritatively, and has even on occasion gone so far as to caution the inspectors of the schools against interference in the choice of books. A very limited right of rejection is left to them, but they are wholly denied that of selection. The responsibility of choosing the books to be used in any particular school lies with the local board of management, and in many cases it is practically vested in the schoolmaster or schoolmistress. But while the Council of Education abstains from interference in the choice of books, the Education Code prescribes subjects of instruction and lays down in outline the scheme of examination. While the Council refuses the responsibility of providing a set of books out of which it might be possible for the children to learn the things it wishes them to be taught, it throws out, from time to time, hints as to what these books should contain; and such hints are invariably acted upon by the people who make it their business to cater for the schools. In 1876 the Lords of Council especially charged the inspectors to do all they could to promote the teaching of cookery and the establishment of penny savings-banks, and to lose no opportunity of pointing out to managers and teachers the advisability of making all the lessons tend as far as possible to the inculcation of habits of thrift and practical industry. The Code had lately sanctioned the introduction into the school curriculum of special scientific subjects, and these instructions to inspectors breathed throughout a spirit of distrust towards the new subjects and a desire to counteract their injurious tendencies by reinforcing the practical side of education. The official hint was not lost upon the book-makers. From that time, every new set of Reading Books was crowded with lessons in the domestic and technical arts, with anecdotes having a strong economical bias, and chapters in which story and science were mixed with the usual bad results to both. The Code of 1880 increased the number of optional scientific subjects and recommended that some of them should be taught by means of reading lessons; and a circular addressed to inspectors in the course of the same year showed that the official attitude towards the

scientific subjects had undergone a change. There was no further insistence on the teaching of thrift, or the domestic and technical arts; and indirectly, a protest was made against the mixing up of science with moral and literary matter. It was distinctly advised that for every scientific subject taught in the schools, a Reading Book wholly devoted to that subject should be used. This suggestion called the Science Reader into existence. From that time to this, little books treating of history, grammar, geography, astronomy, physiology, and political economy, in a conversational tone, and sometimes in a conversational form, have been continually appearing. Some of these are very nice little books in themselves, but whether they are likely to be of the slightest use for teaching classes of children in national schools is another question. The reports of the school inspectors suggest pretty strongly that they are not. And the testimony of most people who have taught children, as well as that of most people who remember how they learned in their own childhood, confirms the view of the inspectors. Save under exceptionally favourable circumstances such as are not to be insured in an elementary school for children of the working class, boys and girls under fourteen cannot learn science in any serious sense; and to teach science in any sense that is not serious is pure waste of time and a demoralisation of the intelligence of scholar and teacher. Premature acquaintance with words and formulæ which must be understood exactly or else convey no meaning at all, tends to disgust the better minds with branches of knowledge in which most things must appear meaningless, and to foster the tendency of the worse minds to acquiesce in the use of language that does not answer to obvious sense.

But however useless or even mischievous the Science Reader may be, it cannot be more useless, and it will probably be less mischievous, than the chapters on science and thrift and the domestic arts interpolated in the General Reading Books. For the Special Science subjects are optional, and it may therefore be hoped that most of them will not be very widely attempted; while the invention of the Special Science Reader, if it does nothing else, will secure the general Reading Books against any further introduction of pseudo-scientific matter. Among the special subjects recommended by the Code, there are only three which, in the opinion of the present writer, can be taught with profit in elementary schools. These are history, grammar, and geography, the last including such elements of astronomy as everybody ought to know, and every child delights in learning. And of these, history is the only one that can be taught satisfactorily in reading lessons. It may be said in passing that of all the special readers that have so far been produced, those designed for the teaching of history are the best. The idea of teaching grammar philosophically is a very fascinating one, but it breaks down in practice.

The moment you go beyond verbal definitions and fixed rules, you find yourself in difficult regions of logic and metaphysic into which an intelligent child here and there will follow you readily enough, but not a whole class in any school. The Reading Book inevitably goes beyond the line of formal statement, and fails to give an explanation that can satisfy intelligent curiosity. The Geography Reader is not of much use either. No child can learn geography by reading about it in class. Names of countries, towns, rivers, &c., must be learned by heart, as they always used to be, and identified on maps and globes; and whatever more children are capable of learning, will come best in the way of spoken commentary on the lesson. All of astronomy that it is possible or necessary to teach children can be learned from diagrams and such a rude model of the solar system as any handy boy can make with the help of a turning lathe; and it can be learned in no other way. Children may read about rotation, and revolution, and eclipse, in a dozen little books, but they will never realise what they have read unless they can see the processes going on, and handle something that represents the bodies that revolve and rotate and are eclipsed.

Supposing, then, that all special subjects, except history, grammar, and geography (including astronomy), were given up; that history was taught in a set of special Readers, and grammar and geography reduced to strings of questions and answers, which might all go into one Learning Book together with whatever other miscellaneous facts could be cast into the same form—it remains to be considered what should be done with the General Reading Book, which till lately was the only book used in the schools. In one or two quarters it has been suggested that since the invention of the Science Reader, the General Reading Book has become unnecessary, and that instead of considering what we shall put into it in future, we had better make up our minds to do without it. In my opinion, to abolish the General Reading Book would be a very unfortunate course. In the rivalry between the General Reading Book and the Special Science Reader we have only another manifestation of the antagonism between literary and scientific culture that divides educational opinion on more imposing platforms. The General Reading Book represents literature, and the Special Reader, science. And because I believe children to be capable of a great deal of the culture that comes through literature, and of very little of that which comes through science, I should be extremely sorry to see the book that represents literary culture wholly displaced by a crowd of little books pretending to teach special science to minds incapable of learning it. Unfortunately, however, the General Reading Books now existing represent literature so badly that, except for the purpose of a battle-cry, they must rather be said to misrepresent and caricature it, and, by so doing, to render it the worst possible service. In passing this wholesale condemnation upon these books, I am not unmindful of

the good intention and careful labour that have gone to compiling them, nor of the many difficulties attending a work of that kind. The General Reading Books used in our elementary schools ought to be an introduction to the whole field of literature. They ought to introduce the scholars gradually to all those great names and great ideas which represent the common stock of cultivated thought and feeling in the civilised world; and it need hardly be said that the preparation of a set of books which would do this worthily would involve a great deal besides industry and good intention. In such an undertaking a certain amount of scholarship and a great deal more general culture might profitably be put under contribution, besides sympathy with children and practical experience of the drudgery of teaching them. As all these things are not often found together, and as none of them necessarily involves the possession of practical literary talent of the particular kind that appeals successfully to children, it is very probable that a thoroughly good set of Reading Books will never be produced by one person working alone, and without any guarantee that the labour spent on the work will not be wasted. I have already pointed out that, in spite of themselves, a large moral responsibility for the contents of the Reading Books and Readers fastens upon the Council of Education, whose slightest suggestions and most undigested theories are promptly put into practical form by the industrious army of compilers. Already the Council directs in principle, but its direction is rendered valueless by the incompetence of those who obey. Why should it not go further—adopt a scheme and provide for its being carried out?

There are a very large number of these Reading Books in the field. They differ from one another in many respects, but they agree almost without exception in certain important points. Their tone is always one of very inferior culture. They contain too much matter and touch upon too many subjects. And their materials are arranged without due regard to their relative dignity and importance. The greatest names and the smallest are huddled promiscuously together, so that a child might read and remember the contents of the whole course, and never realise that there are a few names whose place in art and literature and life is so far above all others that in relation to them any comparison is absurd, and all talk of equality sacrilege. The books that represent literary culture in our national schools could not have been better constructed, if they had been purposely designed to revoke the titles that the tradition of all the past has conferred, and obliterate the distinctions without which admiration runs riot and veneration loses all meaning.

I have by me at this moment a large collection of these sets of books, and could quote scores of passages from all or any of them in justification of what I have said. But to do so would occupy a great

deal of space, and the result would be very wearisome to readers. I select, therefore, for analysis, the set which is pronounced best by the almost unanimous verdict of the school inspectors, and which I am told is most widely used. This is the series known as "Nelson's Royal Readers."

In a practical matter like this, criticism should be constructive as well as destructive, and I propose, therefore, to append to my analysis of each book suggestions for the making of a better one. I should be sorry, however, to be supposed to advance them with any idea that they are the best in any sense except that of being the best that occur to me. I claim for my plan no higher credit than that of being better than the plan of the books now in use, and, in default of something better still, I offer it for the consideration and criticism of competent persons.

All these books resemble one another in general plan. They are published in sets of six volumes, purporting to be adapted to the progressive intelligence of the standard divisions of the schools. The first three are generally easy and fairly suited to the tastes of children. They are, however, open to the objection that they can do nothing towards developing any higher tastes in those who read them, and very little in the way of storing the mind with ideas worth retaining through life. And, seeing that no impressions are so vivid or so lasting as those which we receive in the beginning of our education, these are very grave defects. Children ought not to read in school, as a serious lesson, anything that is not worth remembering. They need not read anything in school which is beneath the serious interest of those who teach them, and which may not therefore react beneficially on the teachers at the same time that it entertains and interests the scholars. Unless this principle be observed in the selection of subject-matter for the lessons, it will be impossible to impart any dignity to the education given in elementary schools, or to secure a high tone in the teachers. I believe that a great deal of the eagerness shown at this moment by the masters and mistresses for the introduction of the more difficult scientific subjects arises out of weariness of the frivolity and inconsequence of the lessons in the unscientific books, and that a really interesting course of Reading Books would be even more welcome to them than to the children.

Nelson's Royal Reader for the first standard division contains forty-four lessons, of which eighteen are poetry and twenty-six prose. The prose pieces are simple in style and feeling, and of a nature to interest children mildly; but they are without positive merit of any sort, and might easily be replaced by something better. The poetry is well-chosen, and of some of the pieces it may be said that they are all that can be desired. Only, as they are intended to be learned by heart, it would be better to remove them from the

Reading Book to the Learning Book. The principle that the chief business of the Reading Book is to teach children to read, and to care for reading, is now recognised on all hands. It has been announced in official circulars, echoed in the prefaces to the books, and insisted upon by the inspectors in their reports. It only remains to carry it out, and the first step in this direction is to make the Reading Book as much like a book, and as little like an educating machine, as possible. A collection of stories to be read, questions to be answered, and poems to be learned by heart, no more deserves to be called a book than does a volume in which a year's series of a magazine is bound up. Both may contain excellent matter, but they contain it in the form least attractive to readers. I should like, therefore, to see the poetry put into the book from which lessons are to be learned for repetition, and the prose lessons replaced by a selection of *Æsop's Fables* suitably rendered and illustrated. These books are generally illustrated, but the illustrations have the same faults as the text—they are not particularly good in themselves, and they lead to nothing better. It would be a help to future education if all the woodcuts were reproductions of well-known pictures; and this could be managed easily if a corresponding principle were observed in the selection of the subjects of the lessons. The Fables of *Æsop* are among the classical things of knowledge. The ideas embodied in them are part of that common stock of culture which it is desirable to make known to everybody. And they are a part of it which children can understand and enjoy. Fables always have delighted children, and there is no reason to fear that they will ever cease to do so. The talking of beasts and birds comes quite naturally to them, and seems rather more according to the fitness of things than the dumbness of real animals. And the objection to fables, which has lately come into fashion, on the ground that their morality is of a hard and cynical kind, is not of the slightest consequence in relation to children. Children, left to themselves, do not seek a human moral in events. The way of the fable is the way of the universe; the battle is to the strong and the bargain to the cunning. And the point of view of the child, as a perfectly impotent being, is the best possible one for appreciating this. It does appreciate it very keenly, and a large part of its enjoyment of the fable proceeds from its sense of its truth; whereas the moral story, in which the battle is to the good and the bargain to the self-denying, tends to provoke envy and discontent. The idea of developing dangerous analogies between the right in conduct and the fact in Nature is a flight of adult irrationalism that need not be feared from children. It would add to the dignity of this book, and I think also to its charm, if it could bear its proper title of "*Æsop's Fables*" on the cover, and only have printed on the title-page whatever is necessary to insure its being used in the right division of the school.

In the book for Standard II. we have seventy-two lessons, twenty-one of poetry, and fifty-one of prose. Again I should begin by banishing the poetry to the Learning Book, and I should do the same by three lessons in useful knowledge, which are very wisely cast into the form of catechism and very unwisely crowded into print so small that no child should be set to learn them except as a penance. Of the remaining forty-eight pieces, three, being fables, would already have appeared in substance in the first book. The rest, I should turn out to make place for better matter. Like those in the first book, they are for the most part unobjectionable in themselves. There are, however, a few in which the sentiment and moral are distinctly unwholesome. I will confine myself to one illustration. At page 114 is a story called "His Good Angels; or, the Children's Love;" in which two little girls are described as going out at night to seek their father through the streets of a town and finding him at last drunk in a gin-palace. Having found him, they lead him home with difficulty; and the result of the incident is the reformation of the father by the act and influence of his children. The story is told with detail, and it occupies two pages and a-half of the book. Moreover, it is followed up by a set of questions which I transcribe, because it is necessary to the appreciation of the importance of careful selection, that people should realise that the contents of these books are not merely read but studied and driven home by a system of minute examination. I have sketched the story: these are the questions upon it:

"Why did the little girls go out by night? How did they meet the wind? Why were they not afraid? Where did they stop? What did they do? What did a man say? What did he do? What passed between him and the children? Where was the father? What did he do when he saw Ada and Jano? What did a man say? What did another man call the children? What happened the next night? What did their father say? What had saved their father? What was the result?"

Now, in itself, this system of minute examination in what has been read, is excellent. It is the best means of testing attention and checking inattention. It has also the advantage of bringing out with wholesome force the worthlessness of a good deal of the matter to which it is applied. It is surely not an exaggeration of delicacy to object to a story like this being driven into the minds of children in whose lives the drunken father and the gin-palace are only too common circumstances. In another story which we used all to read a generation ago about a drunken father and his three sons, the moral was pointed in a different direction and one more consistent with the teaching of a commandment we also learned in those days, and which, as far as I know, has not yet been improved upon. But it is time to pass from criticism to suggestion. This second book would be much more interesting and also more educating, if all its prose chapters, good, bad, and indifferent, were to make way for

the familiar fairy stories of Grimm's collection, selections from the Arabian Nights, and a few of the very best of Hans Andersen's tales. Little Red Riding Hood, Cinderella, Beauty and the Beast, Sindbad the Sailor, Ali Baba, and Aladdin, are heroes and heroines of romance, whom not to know is to be outside the pale of cultivated conversation of the most elementary sort. And yet people can only know them by reading about them; and children whose homes are not cultivated must look to the school for instruction in these classics of the nursery as well as for the graver matter of more advanced education. I should like this volume to be called *Fairy Stories*, and like its predecessor, to bear all marks of particular destination only in a subordinate way on its title-page.

The Third Standard book contains a hundred and one lessons; twenty-one in poetry and eighty in prose. I have absolutely nothing of a positive nature to urge against any of these; but, for the general reasons I have stated so often, I think they might all be profitably cast out. The same considerations of space which make it impossible to go into detailed criticism of all that is bad, prevent my doing justice in detail to much that is good. I wish, however, to say distinctly that in this book there is much that is fairly good, though it is of a sort which I do not believe to be of much use for the purpose of class teaching. There are several chapters about animals and about the climate and customs and productions of foreign countries, which are doubtless very good for children to read if they are interested in such matters. But my experience is that children for the most part care only to hear about these things, either from particular people who have the gift of lively narration, or as bearing upon something that they have themselves seen and known. For the few children who have a real taste for natural history and stories of travel, there are plenty of books which they ought to be able to get from the school lending library and to read at home. The lessons on common things are good again; but again they are given in penitential print, and had better be removed to a book where a little more space could be accorded to them. In place of these hundred and one miscellaneous lessons, I propose that the children in the Third Standard division should use a book into which should be gathered the tales of all those heroes and heroines of the past, whose stories float in the region between fact and legend, besides a great many who belong indisputably to the kingdom of fact, but who, for one reason or another, are more vividly presented in art and literature than in such history as children can read.

It would be rash in the course of an article like this to attempt to give a complete catalogue of the names that should be contained in this gallery of heroes. But for the sake of distinctness it is well to suggest a few, and to say that every suggestion is based upon experience of the attraction for children possessed by the character or

the story. The typical deliverers of mankind should be there—the mythical Prometheus, and Hercules, and Perseus; the philosophers—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle; the founders of the great religions of the world—Zoroaster, Bouddha, Mahomet; the patron saints of Christendom—St. George, St. Michael, St. Christopher, St. Nicholas; the great female saints, Catherine, Cecilia, Ursula, Margaret; the fathers of the Christian Church, the founders of the monastic orders. And unless the books of history used in the schools include (as they should do, but as at present they do not) some slight outline of the stories of Greece and Rome, place should be found for a good number of the soldiers and patriots of the ancient world. The names that I have suggested, and many more that I could suggest, will inevitably be met with in later life. They live as the representatives of schools of thought, of religious movements, of inspiring ideals. They have been celebrated in painting and poetry. They are alluded to in daily conversation and in the articles of the magazines and the newspapers, which are the only reading of so large a portion of the community. Not to have distinct conceptions of the persons to whom they belong is not only to lose a great deal of direct enlargement of the intellectual and moral sympathies, but to be unable to use the current coin of intelligent society. I am aware that round many of them, there have unfortunately gathered clouds of doctrinal controversy which have eclipsed for the majority of English men and women the simple human worth of those who bore them; and that, on this account, some will say that it is impossible to tell their stories in a book intended to be used in schools where the teaching must be unsectarian. But this impossibility exists only in the minds of those who have never tried to do the thing. Those who have tried it in good faith, know the difficulties to be purely theoretical. And in this, as in every other detail of the matter, the testimony of experience is of far more value than the foresight of the most complete theory. This part of my subject is one on which it is difficult to dwell at length without passing from practical criticism and suggestion to considerations of a kind that are usually called sentimental—and this I shrink from doing. The highest moral and spiritual results of education are just those which it is least possible to promise certainly as the consequence of any particular course of training. They are none the less those which every parent and every teacher who is worthy to be intrusted with the direction of a child's intelligence has most at heart, and considers most in the choice of the subjects and characters to be brought under the child's notice. We all admit in general terms that the aspirations and actions of our lives are influenced in some degree by the examples with which our childhood is acquainted, and we all recognise more or less the importance of so arranging the surroundings of the children under our care that their suggestion shall be pure and noble rather than base and foul. To

go much further than this in speech or writing on a question of national education is to risk drifting into cant or clap-trap, and to provoke objection on the ground that the moral and spiritual influences of a day-school weigh almost as nothing against those of the home and the street, and that in nine cases out of ten the conditions of these children's homes are not such as can help the growth of the good seed sown in the school-hours. This is true enough to make it unwise to indulge in any very confident anticipation of great results from the best-directed efforts; the truer it is, however, the more reason is there for insisting that some effort shall be made in the right direction.

But though it is wise to say as little as possible about the direct moral and spiritual good that may come to children from being made early acquainted with types of noble character and examples of devoted action, there is no occasion for diffidence or reserve in speaking of another closely related aspect of the matter. The heroes of the world are also the heroes of the world's literature and art. The names that the child had learned to know in this book, he would meet again and again in all the best books he might open in after life, and he would meet them still among the greatest. The myths and legends he had read in school, he would find represented in every gallery of old pictures he might visit. By having made friends in the course of a year's reading with the most prominent figures in art and literature, he would be secured against the unhappy feeling of strangeness which scares so many from the very threshold of culture. He would feel at home in real books and among real pictures, because the principal subjects of them would be familiar to him. This is not a point of sentiment, but of the most commonplace experience. Every child, and not every child only, but every man and woman, is more easily drawn to read and observe what is already familiar than what is wholly strange. The utterly unknown is easily mistaken for the unknowable, and accidental ignorance for incapacitating stupidity. People, whose early education has been neglected, often spend their lives in turning sulkily away from opportunities of culture which in no circumstances could have profited them during childhood, under an erroneous impression that they ought to have learned everything then, and that not having done so they can learn nothing later; and in no departments of knowledge is this unhappy mistake so common or so unreasonable as in art and literature. But though grown-up people may deny themselves pleasures that are open to them under an impression that they are not clever enough to enjoy them, children are never troubled by such scruples of false modesty. They are ready enough to claim a share in any enjoyment that comes in their way, and it rests with those who direct their earliest training to put them in the way of the enjoyments that

are best. And such a book as this, though it might fail as a means of direct moral culture, could not but serve in some measure as a key to those interests which in after life help indirectly to refine manners and purify sentiment.

The book for the Fourth Standard has 288 pages, into which are crowded,—outlines of British History from B.C. 55 to A.D. 1703, five lessons on words, fifty miscellaneous prose lessons, and thirty-four pieces of poetry. The outlines of history are compressed into 40 pages of very small print. The word lessons occupy 14 pages of the same type. Both are fairly good of their sort, though they would be better in another place, and some of the information given in the word lessons is rather undignified. For instance, such a definition as “Burke, to murder and destroy, from Burke, a notorious murderer (1829),” might have been left out with advantage, as the book does not pretend to be a dictionary of universal information. Among the forty miscellaneous lessons it is pleasant to be able to say again that many are good of their kind; but it is also necessary to say that a great many (of some of which I propose to speak in detail later on) are positively bad. Worse, however, than any fault of any particular piece in the book is the principle upon which it is compiled. At this stage of the series, prose extracts from all sorts of writers, dead and living, are introduced, so that in addition to the bewildering variety of subjects that the child has had to cope with all along, it has now to overcome the difficulties of a great variety of styles. Of course the idea is, that it is desirable to acquaint the scholars with as many writers as possible, and that the best way of doing this is to give them a collection of specimen pages to read and study. But this idea is unfortunately a very unsound one. It is a very doubtful advantage to a child to know a great variety of writers, and it is quite impossible for it to know or understand the style of any one writer, who is worth understanding and knowing, by reading or even learning by heart one or two pages cut out of a work of which the scheme remains unknown. Children, left to themselves, will often wade through the longest and most difficult books and get both delight and instruction from them; and the thing that first attracts them and afterwards holds them is almost always the same thing that attracts and holds grown-up readers—charm of style. Children are really the only large portion of the reading public for whom style is the supreme thing in a book. They know nothing about it, but they feel it, and they will read on contentedly, though the sense may be almost wholly dark, provided the rhythm of the sentences is sympathetic to them. And, again like grown-up readers, they get to know their author more truly through his style than through his statements. But this is not to be done in the course of one page, or two, or three. One utterance of the

spell may be enough to charm, but it must be repeated many times before it can illuminate. And the one utterance may not even charm. The same child who might read the whole of *Paradise Lost* or the *Faery Queen* for its own delight would, as likely as not, be quite indifferent to any particular page of either that its teacher happened to select for it; for no single page can give the whole spirit of the author, or the whole scheme of the work; and these are the things a child reads for. If he can get hold of them, he will be content not to understand a great deal of detail; if he misses them, he will understand nothing at all, and it will be to no purpose to cram his memory with the finest passages of all the masters of prose and poetry. But bad as is this system of feeding children's minds on scraps even when care is taken that all the scraps are good in themselves, the evil becomes much greater when many of the scraps are very far from good. It is unprofitable to taste a succession of good styles, but it is positively injurious to study patterns of bad style. And some of the pieces given in these books are patterns of very bad style; while others, without being exactly bad in themselves, are so unsuitable to children that they become bad in relation to the purpose of these books. There is a chapter on "The Hand" and another on "The Eye," which—though they might pass muster in a magazine where they would be lightly read and as lightly forgotten—provoke a great deal of criticism when they appear in a book intended to be studied. They contain no solid matter. What they say would be just as well left unsaid, for any substantial fact or idea which it is capable of conveying, and it has not even the merit of being well said. Still less has it the merit of being said in such a way as to be easily understood by a child.

The chapter on "The Hand" begins thus:—"In many respects the organ of touch, as embodied in the hand, is the most wonderful of the senses. The organs of the other senses are passive; the organ of touch is active. The eye, the ear, and the nostril stand simply open; light, sound, and fragrance enter, and we are compelled to see, to hear, and to smell; but the hand selects what it shall touch, and touches what it pleases." This sort of thing is carried on through rather more than three pages, in the course of which we have an enumeration of the good things and the bad things the hand of man has done, interspersed with ejaculatory passages like this, "A steam engine is but a larger hand, made to extend its powers by the little hand of man! An electric telegraph is but a long pen for that little hand to write with! All our huge cannons and other weapons of war, with which we so effectually slay our brethren, are only Cain's hand made bigger, and stronger, and bloodier!"

Now of course there is nothing wicked in all this. At most it is twaddle, and twaddle has its uses, and need not be too severely

treated while it keeps in its proper place. But a lesson book is not the proper place for twaddle, any more than a drilling ground is a proper place for feather beds. A chapter like this about "The Hand" is absolutely useless in substance and extremely inconvenient in style. This last objection may not be apparent on the first glance to any one who is not in the habit of teaching children and does not know how, in writing of this sort (which is mostly verbiage), every word that does not explain itself becomes a stumbling-block. There is no solid thing or idea behind the words, and the teacher is driven to explain one difficult expression by another equally difficult and not really synonymous. Take the first sentence for instance: "*In many respects the organ of touch, as embodied in the hand, is the most wonderful of the senses.*" It is a sentence that no sane person would think of addressing to a child of ten years old; and this of itself should exclude it from a lesson to be read by a class of children all about that age. How will you explain *in many respects*? How, *the organ of touch*? How will you distinguish between the hand and the organ embodied in it? And when you have surmounted all these difficulties, what new fact or idea will you have put into a child's mind? You will have told it that its hand is more wonderful in some ways than its eye, or its ear, or its nose, and in conveying this very questionable truism you will have inevitably given it several inaccurate definitions of words that need not have been used at all. The lesson on "The Eye" begins in a still more embarrassing way, and leads to issues equally blank. The first sentence is this: "It is one of the prerogatives of man to have eyes;" and a number attached to "prerogatives" directs us to a footnote running thus:—

"Prerogative, privilege, *lit.* right of voting before others. [*Lat.* *prærogativus*, asked before others (for a vote or opinion): from *præ*, before; *rogo*, I ask.]"

The note is well enough, but it is very interrupting. On the other hand, *prerogative* is a word that children cannot be expected to know, and it must be explained before the lesson is gone on with. So a conscientious teacher will read the note, and having read it, will, it is to be hoped, explain that also. And this second explanation will necessitate parenthetical lectures on the political institutions of Rome and the relation between the English language and the Latin; in the course of which the children's minds will stray far enough from "the eye;" and when the incidental lectures are ended and the wandering thoughts are called back, it will not be much easier than it was before to say what *prerogative* means in its present place; because, as a matter of fact, it is improperly used, and has no right to be there at all. If it was necessary to convey the grain of obvious truth this sentence contains, it could have been done in the three words, "men have

eyes." A great deal of time would have been saved, and much weariness to the scholars and mortification to the teacher.

If these were solitary instances of words wasted over things not worth saying, it would be captious to dwell upon them. But they are not. The last three books are full of matter of this sort, and only those who have gone through the penance of hearing a class of school children read these chapters, can know how tedious and unprofitable the process is. I will give one more example from the fifth book, and pass on. Here is an extract from a chapter called "Living Stoves," which professes to explain the process of animal combustion :—

"Granting that our bodies are veritable stoves, the reader will desire to know where we procure our fuel. Fortunately, our coal and firewood are stored up in a very interesting form. They are laid before us in the shape of bread and butter, puddings and pies: rashers of bacon for the labourer, and haunches of venison or turtle soup for the epicure. Instead of being brought up in scuttles, they are presented in tureens, dishes, or tumblers, or all of them, in pleasant succession. In fact, whenever you send a person an invitation to dinner, you virtually request the honour of his company to take fuel; and when you see him enthusiastically employed on your dainties, you know that he is literally 'shovelling' fuel into his corporeal stove."

I abstain from comment on this passage, preferring to leave the reader to judge for himself whether it is worth while to compel people to send their children to school to read things of this sort. The fifth book contains rather more of the same kind of matter as the fourth, with the addition of one or two new features. It has "rhetorical passages" which have not appeared before, and one of these is Pitt's famous reply to Walpole's taunt about his youth. It has outlines of fourteen lives of great men, which are intended as a foundation for compositions to be written by the scholars. These outlines are extremely bald and dry, and, obviously, as the children have no independent knowledge of their subjects, they must be filled up with words and phrases meaning nothing at all; for biographical facts cannot be arrived at by efforts of imagination or reflection. Then there are some chapters on Hygiene, from which the parents of the children might possibly derive some benefit, but which the children themselves can only find extremely dull, unless children of the working class are strangely different from children in every other class. No one expects the sons and daughters of gentlemen to know how to diet themselves, and ventilate their rooms, and guard against infection of small-pox and typhoid fever before they are thirteen years old; and it is difficult to see why such knowledge should sit more suitably on the children of workmen. Parents are provided by nature for children of all classes, and it is better that children should trust to even the most imprudent parents in matters of this sort than that they should take the management of them into their own hands. Besides, does anybody suppose that boys or girls will eat stale bread

instead of new, because they have read in *Nelson's Royal Readers* that "stale bread digests more easily than new," or will sit still after meals because it is written that "the process of digestion requires rest for the whole body?" Of course everybody knows that they will not. But then why go through the mockery of pretending to think they will, and waste space and time that might be profitably occupied?

The book for the Sixth Standard contains a greater quantity and variety of matter than any of the preceding volumes. To point out every unsuitable item of its contents would be an endless task; but I cannot refrain from pointing out two pieces which appear to me especially out of place; an essay on the *Evidences of Design in Creation*, and Burke's description of the French Court on the eve of the Revolution.

All this heterogeneous matter is crowded into a small octavo volume of four hundred pages. And the text is enriched with tables of verbal definitions, explanatory footnotes, and questions for examination. The footnotes and the definitions could not well be dispensed with in a book of scraps; but they do not add to the attractiveness of the volume. The lessons on useful knowledge, on punctuation, physical geography, words, and great inventions are all given in very small type. The biographical appendix contains short notices of one hundred and three different persons who have been mentioned or quoted in the course of the volume. Two examples will serve to show how far these notices are likely to furnish the children with living conceptions of their subjects.

"Æschylus, the father of the Greek drama, was born at Athens in 525 B.C. He was wounded at Marathon (490 B.C.), and fought at Salamis (480 B.C.). He was the first to introduce on the stage more actors than one, and to give them appropriate dresses. Of ninety dramas produced by him, only seven have come down to us. In 468 B.C. Sophocles defeated him in the public competition of dramas, and he retired to Sicily, where he died in 456 B.C." It is apparently assumed that everything connected with Sophocles belongs to the class of innate ideas. No note is devoted to him, and though this familiar mention of him suggests that steps have been already taken to make him known, I cannot find any piece throughout the series in which he figures as subject. My other example shall be Shelley:—"Shelley, Percy Bysshe, an eminent English poet, was born in Sussex in 1792. His father was a baronet. His fine poetical genius was marred by his openly flaunted infidelity. His chief works are—*Queen Mab*, *Alastor*, and *Prometheus Unbound*; but he is better known by his minor poems—*The Skylark*, *The Cloud*, and *The Sensitive Plant*. He was drowned in the Gulf of Spezzia (Italy) in 1822."

What profit can there be to any child in reading notices like

these of one hundred and three miscellaneous persons, ranging from Plato to Mr. W. H. Russell? The commonest biographical dictionary gives its information in as attractive and impressive a manner. And the commonest dictionary has the merit of being virtually complete: it gives everybody's name, whereas the biographical appendix gives only those of one hundred and three people whom the chances of selection have brought into the volume. And here is perhaps the best place for saying that no set of general Reading Books can be quite sufficient to itself. It is the attempt to make them so that has brought the existing books to their present state. Every school should have its shelf or shelves of dictionaries and other books useful for reference. It is as important that people should learn to use books as to read them; and this is best learned in childhood by being made to fetch the dictionary from its place and look out the information wanted to throw light on a difficulty, in the moment when the difficulty is encountered. It is never likely to be learned at all where the Reading Book has its hard words and dark allusions explained in notes attached to every chapter. Of course, so long as books are used in which every sentence and almost every word needs explanation, it is necessary that the etymological dictionary, and the biographical dictionary, and the gazetteer, should be included in the Reading Books, as the class would otherwise be continually running backwards and forwards to the book-shelf. But if, as is much to be desired, all merely verbal difficulties could be cleared out of the reading-lessons, and only those difficulties left which can be solved by looking out the new or forgotten word or name in the proper book, then the occasional acts of reference which interrupted the reading would be extremely beneficial, not only for the sake of the good habit of which they ought to be the beginning, but for the peeps into larger fields of knowledge which would be got in the course of them. And reference should be made from time to time to other books than dictionaries. Every school should have its collection of standard works of real literature, out of which the scholars should be made to read passages bearing upon the lessons in the school-books. The same page of Milton or Shakespeare that neither interests nor instructs when it is read in its turn, among scores of miscellaneous extracts from all sorts of authors, may teach much and suggest more, when it is looked up in its own place and read with reference to some passage of history or literature to which it bears a natural relation. In these days of cheap books it is really disgraceful that any school should be without its library of standard books. There is hardly a writer of classical reputation whose works may not be purchased in some edition for a few shillings, so that a very few pounds ought to furnish a shelf that would be fairly representative of English literature. It would be better, however, for the dignity of our

national schools, as well as for the indirect education of the children in them, if economy were not allowed to rule exclusively in this matter. A Globe edition of Shakespeare is better than none, and very useful in some ways to those who possess another. But a Globe edition can hardly be said to represent adequately the dignity of Shakespeare, or the space in literature covered by his work. And this is a consideration not without importance in view of the fact that the children of the working class do not grow up among books as children of the upper classes do. They have no good libraries at home. They do not see—and for some purposes of education to see books is as good as to read them—they do not see the best books wearing the most decorous bindings and occupying the best places on the walls of their own homes and those of their neighbours. They do not hear them talked about even in the superficial manner of second-hand literary conversation. They are in the way of knowing nothing whatever of books or authors, except what they learn at school; and this being so, the school should neglect no means of emphasizing the importance of the things that are best to read.

In discussing the last three volumes of the series of Reading Books, I have departed from my plan of placing suggestion side by side with criticism. It was more convenient to criticize the three books in a group, and proceed afterwards to suggestion. Hitherto I have recommended that fables and fairy stories, portraits of heroes, and old myths and legends should be used instead of moral stories and chapters about animals and foreign countries. With the fourth year I think a more connected course of reading should begin. I propose, therefore, that the miscellaneous matter of the fourth and fifth Reading Books should be replaced by something like a coherent account of ancient and modern literature. I purposely avoid saying a history of literature, because the sort of book that is produced by way of a history of literature for children is the very last thing that I have in my mind. All such books, that I have ever seen, are at once too full and too empty. They contain hosts of names and dates, and neat phrases of literary criticism, and almost nothing of that which children want to know about books and the authors of books. The book that I am thinking of, would be constructed in such a way as to communicate full and living ideas of a few of those greatest names who stand incontestably above the crowd, and fill, however indistinctly, the largest place in universal recognition. The fourth book should contain studies of Homer, Virgil, and Dante. The fifth book should be devoted to English literature; and the representative names would be Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Johnson, and Scott. The school year has three terms, and this scheme would give, in the fourth year, one name to

each term ; in the fifth, two. It is not necessary to give reasons for the selection of the names proposed for the fourth book. They are the inevitable names : they select themselves. Some knowledge of the Homeric poems, of the *Æneid* and the *Divine Comedy*, is necessary to the right understanding of the literature of our own country, and happily it is by no means difficult to make the scheme of any of them intelligible to children. Neither will it be necessary to justify most of the names suggested for the English book. I can conceive, however, that the right of Johnson to fill the space between Milton and Scott, might be challenged. I can only say that the ground of selection is the same in this case as in all the others. Between Scott and Milton there is no name in literature that is so much a household word, no figure that is so familiar as that of Dr. Johnson. He is known without being known, as are only those whom universal suffrage has elected.

It need hardly be said that round these representative names, many more would naturally group themselves, so that each section would be a study of a period as well as a portrait of a man. It is also obvious that no uniform plan of treatment could be followed. All that can be said generally on this point, is that in one and all of these studies the matter should be as substantive as possible. There should be from beginning to end no single phrase of literary criticism. It is as unnecessary and unsuitable to talk to children about style in literature, as about etiquette in social matters, or orthodoxy in religion. All they want to know in regard to a writer is what he wrote about, what manner of man he was, what was passing in the world at the time when he lived, and what part he took in public life. The quantity of information that it is possible or edifying to give upon these points, varies of course in different cases, and this variation will determine the method of treatment.

I have now suggested substitutes for five of the books that are read during the six school years ; and the new course, as I have sketched it, stands thus :—

- | | | |
|----------|---------|---|
| Standard | I. | Æsop's Fables. |
| „ | II. | Fairy Tales (from Grimm's collection, the Arabian Nights, and other sources). |
| „ | III. | A Book containing portraits of heroes of real and legendary fame. |
| „ | IV. | Studies of Homer, Virgil, and Dante. |
| „ | V. | English Literature— |
| | Part I. | Chaucer. Spenser. |
| | „ II. | Shakespeare. Milton. |
| | „ III. | Johnson. Scott. |

In place of the sixth and last book, I am not disposed to suggest any one volume. It is very desirable that no boy or girl should leave school without having read at least one real book through.

And I think that in order to secure this, a good number of standard works should be authorised for study during the last term. It would not be wise to leave the choice entirely to the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, or even to the managing boards. Neither would it be wise to insist upon some two or three books being read in all the schools to the exclusion of all others. The first course would make it impossible to secure the choice, in every case, of books of which suitable editions existed, and what is even more important, of books which the masters and mistresses had studied thoroughly. The second course would rob the managers of all discretionary power and prevent the schools from deriving benefit from whatever special taste or knowledge the teachers might possess. The desirable thing seems to me to be that a number of books considerably larger than could be actually read during the year, should be selected; that choice within these limits should be left to the managers of the schools; and that whatever books were officially sanctioned for this purpose should be studied thoroughly by the masters and mistresses in the course of their training. The list should include no books but classics. Among these there should be as much variety as possible, both in kind and in degree of difficulty, so that different courses could be chosen from it, according to the average of intelligence in the schools. For instance in a school where the standard was high, the course might be:— for the first term, a play of *Shakespeare*—*King John*, or *Julius Cæsar*; for the second, the first book of the *Færy Queene*; for the third, one of the *Waverley Novels*—*Ivanhoe* or the *Talisman*. The play and poem would of course have to be carefully studied, the novel simply to be read. In a school where the average of intelligence was low, it might be wise not to attempt anything more difficult in poetry than one of Scott's metrical romances, and in prose than *Robinson Crusoe*. But these are details which it might perhaps have been wiser to avoid altogether, and which I have certainly no wish to insist upon. My desire throughout has been to suggest that it is not very difficult to devise a course of reading adapted to the understanding of children between the ages of five and thirteen, and at the same time capable of imparting ideas and knowledge worth retaining through life, rather than to prove that there is only one course suitable to this purpose. And I have gone into detail only because there is no other way of showing that I have considered the matter practically as well as theoretically. It is probable that a great many different courses might be suggested which would serve as well or better than that which I have sketched. But it is not at all probable that a great many good schemes will ever get themselves into practical form, or that even one will do so, so long as the production of these books is left to private enterprise.

MARY ELIZABETH CHRISTIE.

OVER-PRODUCTION.

THE question which it is proposed to discuss in this paper, namely, whether over-production is possible, may appear at first sight to savour of paradox. If there is one condition of modern industry which more than another makes itself apparent, it is surely the frequent production of commodities in excess of the demand for them. Using the term over-production to denote that more commodities are produced at a given time and place than can be taken off in the existing state of the market, the thing is constantly occurring. A familiar illustration is afforded by the recent state of the iron trade of this country, when the demand fell off to such an extent that a large accumulation of manufactured iron took place, which could not be sold at a remunerative price, that is, at a price which covered the cost of production, including a reasonable return on the manufacturer's capital; and many of the iron works were in consequence closed for a time, and large numbers of workmen were thrown out of employment. Another example of not uncommon occurrence which will at once occur to the recollection is that of a glut in the Manchester cotton trade. These are special and isolated cases of over-production. They are temporary in character; the glut finally disappears after causing more or less suffering, to be succeeded by an active demand for the goods in question. But arising out of the frequency of such cases, there may often be noticed the prevalence of an uneasy apprehension, which finds utterance in a good deal that is said and written at the present day, lest there may come a time of general over-production, when the world will produce more than it can consume; when there will be more workmen than there is work for them to do; and when the distress which is now occasional and exceptional will become the normal condition of the majority. The sentiment finds still more forcible utterance in the fear so often expressed that the commercial supremacy of England may pass over to some rival, and her prosperity suffer a decline in consequence. The assumption implied in these gloomy forecasts is obviously that there is some definite quantity of commodities, and no more, which the world can consume; and that if one country produces so much of this, there is only the balance left to be produced by the others. If America should become a great producing country—I am here speaking of manufactured goods, not of food or raw commodities—the demand for English goods, it is assumed, must fall off; hence the decline of English commerce and general decadence of the country are in store for us.

There are thus two cases to be considered—temporary over-production of a single commodity, or class of commodities; and general over-production as a final and permanent condition. And first, as regards the more simple case, the over-production of a single class of things, say Manchester piece-goods. In ordinary times the out-turn of these goods goes on increasing year by year in a geometrical ratio; the trade is ever expanding; then suddenly there comes a time when the demand ceases to increase, or may even decline; and the result which ensues is said to be due to over-production. Now, unfortunately, there is no room for doubt about the reality of the suffering and distress in such cases; but what is the real cause which has brought it about? Some country or countries which have been regularly taking this increasing supply stop doing so, or take only a smaller quantity. There is said to be a falling off in the demand. But this is, of course, merely the technical way of expressing the fact; the demand has not really fallen off in the sense that the people of these countries would not be quite ready to go on taking the goods if they could get them. What has really happened is that they have not been able themselves to produce commodities which they might offer in exchange for our goods. For example, a famine occurs in India; the crops which would in ordinary course be exported from that country are not raised, or are all required for home consumption; hence the glut of goods at Manchester. But clearly what has happened is not over-production at Manchester, but under-production or non-production in India. The late war in Eastern Europe furnished another instance of the same sort. A considerable part of the population of that part of the world was diverted from its normal employment of producing exchangeable commodities to doing what, in an economical point of view, was worse than doing nothing—the work of destruction. One result was a glut in our markets. So with regard to the assumed over-production in the iron trade. The people of the United States had for a time diverted an undue proportion of their available labour and capital from the production of food to the construction of railroads, which left them for a time with no stock of surplus exchangeable commodities, so that our manufactured iron could not be taken off at its usual rate. In all these cases it was the stoppage in production in some other part of the world which brought about the appearance of over-production here. This is no doubt well understood by those who have given attention to the subject; but it is very far from being a mere truism, especially when we come to consider the more general question of the prospects of the world as regards production in the future. People may have a clear view of each special and isolated case, who yet but dimly perceive what is to be the final solution of

the general problem, or what are the conditions involved in it. Men will speak of the revival of trade, when it is depressed, as a thing to be confidently expected some day or other, just as in a season of bad weather they look for a change to fine, who yet in the same breath express their apprehension lest the time may come when trade will have reached its limit, and will decline finally never again to revive, and when there will be everywhere a redundancy of workmen seeking for employment. I am not speaking here of fears lest any particular branch of industry should be extinguished—not through failure of demand, but through failure of the means of carrying it on : fears lest our supply of coal, for example, should be exhausted, when the industries dependent on it must perforce come to an end : but of the vague apprehension that the supply of labour will eventually overtake demand. Of the widespread existence of this feeling there is hardly room for doubt. It finds expression among other ways in the constantly heard complaint of the overcrowded state of all the professions and the difficulty of finding an opening for young men ; an apprehension founded on the belief that we are approaching to a condition of general over-production—over-production of mental as well as material products.

How far is this fear of ultimate over-production justified ? Even if, as will be conceded by those who take the most gloomy view of the case, the expansion of trade has so far been attended on the whole with an advancement of the material well-being of those engaged in it, although the social condition of the masses may still lag far behind the rate of progress that might be accomplished under a better distribution of the remuneration of the different kinds of labour ; yet is it reasonable to expect that this improvement will continue, even at its present rate and with its attendant train of poverty and want, or will the condition of the majority become still less happy in the future ? And in place of vague forecasts, hopeful or otherwise, is it possible to find any underlying principle by which to test the matter, or must we go on watching the variations in the markets as we do the changes in the weather, with as little insight into the causes of the one as of the other ?

The proper answer to the question embodied in these fears about the world's future will, I believe, be found in the answer to another question, Where does all the wealth of the world come from ? The reply may be made, It comes from saving. It is the surplus of production over consumption. No doubt that is one way of answering the question. If every one consumed as much as he produced there could be no accumulation of anything. Savings are the origin of wealth. But whose savings ? Or, to put the thing in another way, whence comes the wealth found among the different classes who enjoy it ? The merchants, and manufacturers, and ship-

owners, and traders, and the professional classes, who are constantly getting to be both more numerous and more prosperous—these are not the creators of wealth, although a large part of the wealth created finds its way into their pockets. Whence comes the constantly increasing stock of wealth in which they share? Is there any limit to the increase of that stock? And, if so, when will it be attained? Or will the process of general enrichment now going on before our eyes continue indefinitely?

A valid answer to this question may, I venture to think, be found by means of an illustration. We might take the favourite one of a number of persons set down in an island by themselves, and cut off from the rest of the world, and work out the economical consequences, although on a different method from that which has hitherto been employed. But a still more appropriate illustration is afforded by an actually existing case—that of an Indian village community, which, at any rate until modern times, was practically almost as isolated and self-contained as the ideal settlement in a desert island. In the typical Indian village community perhaps ninety per cent. of the inhabitants are engaged in the production of food—in tilling the village lands, in the produce of which all share jointly. Only a very small minority is engaged in trade, which is represented by the leather-worker, who supplies the community with shoes, and the village smith, who repairs the ploughs; there is also the accountant to keep the records, the watchman to guard, and a priest to perform sacrifices; while the æsthetic element is represented by the village minstrel and dancing-girl. All these worthies are paid in kind by a share of the harvest reaped. The women grind the corn and weave the clothes from the home-grown cotton. The only non-productive classes are the old folks past work and the children. But although the whole community are engaged in labour, the production of commodities is limited to replacing wear and tear; for as the surplus food raised goes to the king as rent, and is spent by him in feeding his useless retainers, there is in effect no accumulation of any sort; nothing goes out from the village and nothing comes into it—the condition of the community is a stagnant one. This is because, while the mass of the community find employment in the production of food and the raw material for clothing, the numbers so employed are far in excess of the requirements of the work. Now this stagnant condition may be converted into one of progress, first, by improved agriculture, enabling more food to be produced from the village lands, and a surplus to become available for export in exchange for other things; or, secondly, the labourer's work may become more effective; the tillage may be carried on by a smaller number of hands, and a part of the community may be set free for other occupations. Let us suppose that sixty out of the ninety

persons heretofore employed on tillage are thus set free, and that, still taking their share of the village crops, they apply themselves to working for the comfort of the community—building better houses, making household utensils, furniture, and so on. As they get more skilled the variety of their employment is more extended; some work at one thing, some at another, till finally a state of society might be reached in which the sixty non-agriculturists were working each at a separate occupation, some of these being of a non-material nature, or, by a combination of efforts of a part of the number, commodities might be produced of a more elaborate kind, while the collective village property of all kinds and the means of enjoyment might be continually increasing.

Here, then, we have a civilised and progressive community. Now, what has rendered the change possible? Simply this, that whereas before almost the whole of the community were engaged in raising the food required for their own sustenance, a part of them now suffice for this purpose, and set the remainder free for other pursuits—manufacture, art, literature, and so forth. In other words, those engaged in raising food produce a surplus of food after supplying their own wants, which surplus maintains the rest of the community who are engaged in other occupations, and constitutes the foundation upon which rests the production of all other commodities.

Now what happens in this typical case of a village community holds true for all communities and for the whole world. The existence, not only of manufacturers and merchants, but of all the professional classes, and those who live by furnishing amusement or instruction to others—their existence is possible only because that portion of the world's population which is engaged in the production of food produces more than it consumes. And, further, the profits and incomes of all these classes are not made in trade or business in the sense of being produced by these operations. In the case of the village community, if we suppose it to consist of one hundred persons, each member receives for his remuneration the one-hundredth part of the produce raised by the agricultural portion of the community, whatever be the nature of his occupation; and just so the ultimate source of the remuneration which all classes of society—however they may be employed—obtain for their labours is a share of the surplus food grown by that part of the world's population which is engaged in raising food. The nature of the remuneration may be disguised by the multiplicity of channels through which the wealth of the world is filtered before each man gets his share, and by the still further complication that payments are deferred and earnings accumulated, and by the interposition of money as a representative of value; but this is the ultimate mode of payment in every

case as truly as if all services were paid in kind ; and just as the payment of the seventy non-agricultural members of the village community—whether their occupation be simple or complex, rude or refined—is the surplus food produced by the thirty agriculturists, so the surplus food produced by that part of the world's population which is engaged in agriculture is the measure of the profits and incomes of all other classes of society taken together.

If this view of the case be admitted to be the correct one, we are now in a position to find the proper answer to the question, Whether the condition of general over-production can ever be attained to ? In the typical case brought forward by way of illustration, we have supposed that thirty per cent. of the population are engaged in the production of food, and that the other seventy per cent. are set free for employment in other occupations. Among these latter the division of employments may go on extending until every man is engaged on a separate one, or by a combination of efforts a considerable degree of manufacturing skill might be attained to, and the civilisation and material comfort of the community might advance accordingly. But the advance is subject to this condition, that the number of people to be employed is strictly limited by the amount of food raised. The village lands, in their existing state of culture, are supposed to be capable of supporting only one hundred persons ; and if this number be exceeded, the manufacture of products conducive to comfort and enjoyment might increase, but there would not be enough food for everybody to eat. Whereas before, each member of the community obtained the one-hundredth part of the produce of the land in return for his labour, he would now be entitled only to something less than this amount, which would be insufficient for his support. And if, instead of each person receiving a ratable share of the village produce irrespective of his mode of employment, the distribution was left to be a matter of barter, which is the actual condition of society in general, then while those whose productions were best suited to the tastes and wants of the community might succeed in obtaining more than a ratable share of the available food, others would obtain still less ; the things which these last produced would not find a market. The result would be an apparent over-production of commodities, but in reality a deficiency of food.

Here, then, we approach to a solution of the problem. The conditions of modern society involve the need of provision for a constantly increasing population—that is, a constant increase of the supply of food. In the hypothetical case assumed, the population could only increase and everybody have still enough to eat, either by the village obtaining more land, which alternative is excluded by the hypothesis, or by improved agriculture furnishing more food from the same extent of land. In the case of the whole world the result is obtained

partly in this last way, but in a far larger degree by the opening up of new countries and bringing new soils under cultivation; although it may be observed that using the term, improvement in agriculture, in its widest sense—to include improvements in the means of bringing agricultural produce to market—this opening up of new lands is really one form of improved agriculture. At any rate the result is the same whether an acre is made to produce as much as two acres did before, or whether a fresh acre which was before beyond reach be brought under cultivation. Now the analogy here suggested of the village community, or the self-contained island community, holds good, as I conceive, to the fullest extent for society in general; the process here described as taking place in a limited community is precisely what is taking place over the whole world. The progressive development in the production of all other things than food, including non-material as well as material productions, is due to the division of employments, the combination of efforts, and improvements in labour-saving appliances which result from the better organization of industry; but it is not the production of wealth in the strict sense. Whereas in an earlier stage of civilisation ten men were employed in making a commodity which can now be made by one man, the remaining nine being set free to do other things—herein lies the secret of the increase of commodities and the advance of material civilisation. The result is that things which were scarce now become common, and that new things are invented and brought into use; but the value of the aggregate productions of the community, using the word in the widest sense, and whether those productions be few or many, rude or refined, is in every state of society the food of the persons engaged in producing them, which again is the surplus food raised by the cultivators of the soil. This is the important fact to bear in mind, that the earnings of all classes of society—the so-called productive classes as well as the non-productive; the wages of the sailor, and the income of the ship-owner, and the profits of the merchant; the money turned over by the manufacturer who works up the raw material, and the wages of the artisans employed by him; the profits retained by the tradesmen or distributing agents; the incomes of the professional classes, who get their living out of the savings of the rest of the community, the doctors, and lawyers, and schoolmasters, and authors, and artists; all the earnings—transmitted from one to the other in the form of representative counters—which find their way into the pockets of these people, are not made in business in the sense of being produced there. The production took place at an earlier stage; the subsequent operations are merely of the transfer of wealth previously created, the surplus food, namely, produced by that section of the community which is engaged in agriculture. And just as in the

hypothetical village community of one hundred persons each man's remuneration would be the one-hundredth part of the produce of the village-land, whether he was engaged in grinding corn or writing a tragedy, so the equation between the surplus food produced in the world and all other commodities taken together remains unaffected by the greater or less complexity of the organization of society, or the advance of refinement and mechanical skill. The surplus food produced by that part of the world's population which is engaged in agriculture, and which it exchanges for other things, is the measure of the value of all the other commodities—material and non-material—produced by all the other classes of society taken together. This is the ultimate source of all wealth, not saving merely, but saving of food. It is this surplus which the rest of the world enjoy, struggling for among themselves, and obtaining in very unequal proportions; but the so-called profits of that portion of the community are simply cases of the transfer of wealth previously created by another class, just as much as the so-called profits made on the Stock Exchange are not profits in the real sense of the term, but merely a transfer of property from one man's pocket to another.

One important qualification must here be noted, which will no doubt have been already anticipated by the reader. Man is not sustained by food alone; he needs also to be clothed and warmed and protected from the weather. All the food which a man produces after he has fed himself is therefore strictly not surplus; he must apply a part to satisfy his other needs by exchanging it for raiment and fuel and means of shelter. Further, the implements for agriculture have to be provided. If these are made by the agriculturists themselves, they have so much less time for their proper occupation, and less food will be raised in consequence. If, as is more likely to be the case, these things are made for them by another class of the community, then the food consumed by the latter must be placed in the same category as the food consumed by the tillers of the soil themselves. It is therefore only the available surplus of food, after all these wants are provided for, which constitutes the effective surplus. If the supply of surplus food over and above what the agriculturists themselves consume is no more than sufficient to feed the classes engaged in ministering to their wants, then the condition of the community will be non-progressive, as was that of the hypothetical village community, which grows only enough surplus food to supply the small section of their numbers—village artisans and servants, watchman, priest, and so forth—engaged wholly in ministering to the wants of the remainder. It is only when the surplus food raised is sufficient to maintain other members of the community who produce more commodities than are required by the tillers of

the soil for actual subsistence, and are able to exchange these commodities among each other, that the progressive stage of civilisation is reached.

The term "food," therefore, used here for the sake of brevity, must be taken to include whatever is necessary for sustenance. Returning now to the main point at issue, and reserving for future notice another important qualification, which will probably have been suggested by what has just been said, we are now in a position to see distinctly the conditions under which over-production may occur. The problem evidently turns on the equilibrium necessary to be maintained between the increase of population and the increase in the supply of food. So long as the production of food goes on increasing—that is, so long as new soils continue to be brought under cultivation, and old soils to be rendered more productive—the population engaged in the production of all other things may go on increasing too. If exact equilibrium between the two things is maintained, the condition of society will be in effect the same as that of a stationary population, and there can be no over-production. On the contrary, by the development of labour-saving appliances, the production of commodities of all sorts may go on increasing indefinitely, the result being that the value of all other things measured in food will be reduced, and a larger share of them will on the average be available for everybody. The condition of the community will become more and more prosperous; every one will have enough to eat, and all other things will be cheaper and more abundant. By cheapness is meant, of course, that a larger quantity of them will exchange for the same amount of food, all question of money value or price being foreign to the point, as money prices depend merely on the less or greater abundance of the precious metals. But if this equilibrium between food supply and increase of population is not maintained, then over-production will occur, or rather the result will take the apparent form of over-production, although what would really occur is a deficiency of food. This might be disguised under the complexity of modern civilisation. In the struggle for the available supply of food, the more industrious and intelligent, and those who displayed most intelligence in administering to the wants and desires of mankind, would get a sufficiency; the less fortunate and active would be the first sufferers; and the phenomena most prominently apparent would be the production of commodities which could be soonest dispensed with by mankind—in short, over-production and the increase of pauperism, disguising what had really happened, a deficiency of food. But, subject to the condition that the population engaged on the production of other things does not increase faster than the supply of surplus food, the notion that there can be such a thing as over-production, or that there can

be more things produced than the demand can be found for, is from the nature of the case untenable. The wants of man are illimitable, and can never be fully satisfied. The only thing of which there can be over-production is man himself. There may be too many men in the world ; there cannot be too many things produced by man.

A pertinent illustration bearing on this subject is afforded by the enormous class of persons, now non-productive and withdrawn from useful labour, serving in the collective armies of Europe. Suppose these armies to be disbanded, and the men composing them to return to civil life. The probable effect, it may be said, would be a glut in the labour market ; and so there might be in one sense, and as a temporary condition, before new occupations were found for these men. But clearly the community would not really be the poorer, because while the supply of food would remain undiminished, its consumption would not be increased by the transfer of the soldiers to civil employment ; and as soon as new fields of labour were discovered everybody would be better off than before ; there would be as much to eat, and people would be better housed and clothed and more fully supplied with comforts and amusements. Still further, if, as would probably happen, a part of the available labour thus set free were to transfer itself to new countries, and engage in farming, there would be a sudden change in the ratio of the supply of food to population, with a corresponding stimulus to all other industries. There would be room for population to increase without a reduction in the food values of other products—a result which, strange though it may appear when the thing is stated nakedly, is the true test of material prosperity. Thus it might well happen that all classes of English society, as well as the people of other countries, might enjoy a sudden accession of prosperity from the disbandment or reduction of the gigantic armies of Europe.

These considerations serve to show that an overstocked labour market is an impossibility as a permanent condition, except so far as it arises from the population being in excess of the available food supply. When men compete with one another, it is not in the production of commodities, which can never be in excess of the demand, but for the available supply of surplus food for which these goods are offered in exchange. These considerations also serve to explain the enormous benefit conferred on society by emigration. It is not merely that labour is diverted from an old country to a new ; it is because emigration almost always means the transfer of labour from the production of other things to the production of food, thereby disturbing in a favourable sense the equilibrium between the relative proportions of the two classes of workers into which the world's population is divided, that it gives such a stimulus to all other industries. The additional surplus food created by emigration

increases the aggregate wealth available for the rest of the community. Had America not been discovered the population of Europe would probably have long ago overtaken the means of subsistence, and the struggle for the available supply of food, which is always going on in a greater or less degree, would have become vastly intensified, taking the apparent form of over-production of other commodities. The peopling of the great unoccupied territories of the Western World has averted this calamity. There are marked indications at the present time that the production of food in North America is now about to undergo a rapid and enormous expansion, far exceeding for the time what is required for the normal increase of the world's population. If this forecast be correct, we are on the eve of a sudden access of general prosperity, which, although not without its incidental evils, amongst others the depression of the English agricultural interests until the conditions of English agriculture are modified and become adapted to the new state of things, may have the effect of raising in a marked degree the general standard of well-being of the whole of Europe. It would seem, indeed, that we are about to witness the beginning of a great economical revolution, of a kind almost wholly beneficial to mankind, when the rapid extension of the cultivation of new soils on an enormous scale will stimulate in a degree never before witnessed the demand for all other kinds of production, and will put off the time of general over-production of the only possible kind—an over-production of men—into the indefinite future.

This examination into the conditions which underlie production leads us then to a satisfactory conclusion. If, indeed, it were possible that a time might come when production of other things than food would be in excess of the demand to satisfy wants; if there were some definite amount of trade which the nations of the earth were scrambling for, so that what was gained by one was lost by another; if the struggle for existence was to become ever keener—then, indeed, one might despair of the future of the human race. Happily this is not so. Subject to the condition that there should be food enough for all, the increased production of other things than food by one class or one nation renders possible increased production by all other classes and nations. There is no limit to the capacity of mankind for consumption, and therefore to the demand for productions, using the word in the widest sense. But mankind may fall short of food. And a deficiency of food would have occurred long ere this but for the continued improvements effected in the mode of transporting it from place to place by sea and land; while the danger that food might still run short—at one time a very real and pressing one—has now been staved off indefinitely by the productive power of North America.

But although general over-production is impossible, the occurrence of cases of partial over-production—that is, of the production of some particular commodity in excess of the demand for it at the particular time or place—must still be the normal condition. The tendency of modern trade for particular industries to collect round special centres makes such cases also the more readily apparent, although, of course, the evil is not intensified on this account. The distress caused by a depression in the cotton trade would be just as great were the mills scattered over the United Kingdom as if they were all collected at Manchester. But the conditions of modern trade, with its keen competition and the magnitude of the efforts applied to single operations, serve to aggravate the evil. The desire to take advantage of a rising market almost always results in a glut, to be followed by a period of depression, succeeded in turn by another period of excessive activity. The equilibrium between demand and supply is constantly in course of derangement. And the production of a commodity is often continued for a time after a change of fashion or taste has put an end to the demand. The remedy for the distress occasioned in this way, by the glut of labour in particular occupations, is generally stated to be the competition for labour among different trades, which should keep them at one general level of supply—the workmen are supposed to be always ready to take their labour to the rising market. This, however, is merely a tendency, which in practice is counteracted by other causes, the most powerful arising from an inherent condition of modern industry. The combination of efforts for particular objects, which is its cardinal principle, involves also an extreme division of employments. The man who spends his life in handling one particular machine cannot turn quickly to another business; he must stick to his trade, although his children may be set to a new one, because he is not fit for any other. These people are always liable to be the victims of over-productions.

But in the majority of cases when over-production appears to occur, what has really happened is the non-production of the usual supply of food. One country grows food, and another supplies it with manufactured goods in exchange for its surplus food. If, owing to war or famine there is no surplus food, then the manufactured goods cannot be taken off. The two countries stand in exactly the same position towards each other as the agricultural and non-agricultural members of our hypothetical village community. So stands Manchester towards India; so stands England towards the agricultural communities of the world. The case is complicated in appearance because Manchester does not supply only India with piece goods, but other countries as well; and further that the payment does not always come direct. India may export rice or opium to China, and

China pay for it by sending tea to America, and America pay for the tea by sending bacon and wheat to England; but in this case it is still in effect the surplus produce of India which is exchanged for the Manchester goods; and if there is no surplus produce, those goods cannot be taken. Just in proportion, then, as trade becomes cosmopolitan, and one country supplies its manufactures to the whole world instead of to one country only, will the liability to this form of over-production be abated.

A few words may be added in conclusion to clear up a point which has purposely been kept in reserve. It has been already explained that the term food, as used here, must be taken to include the clothing and other provision necessary to support life; but a further qualification is needed to complete this statement of the case, the nature of which will probably have been anticipated by the reader. In laying down the general proposition which it has been the object of this paper to establish, that the productive classes may be divided into two categories—the producers of food, and the producers of all other things; and that the fund which pays for the latter is the surplus food raised by the first class—the question at once arises, What food is here meant? Admitting the proposition to be true of corn and meat—the necessities of life, does it hold good for the luxuries of diet? Do hothouse fruits and delicate wines, for example, come under the category of food, or should they be included under the head of other products, paid for from the savings of those engaged in simpler forms of cultivation? Here the analogy of a self-contained community will again come in to help us. Let us first suppose, as before, that out of a community of one hundred persons only thirty are engaged on the tillage of land, and that they produce a sufficiency of the simplest forms of food, say wheat or rice, to keep themselves and the other seventy in health. Suppose now that the tastes of the community lead them to desire a change of diet, say to meat and cheese, involving that a portion of the land which heretofore has been growing rice or wheat shall be appropriated to pasture. Then so far as the meat or milk now produced supplies the place of the wheat or rice heretofore grown the economic position is not affected; but if the new diet, although more agreeable, is insufficient in quantity, the deficiency must be made good; and there being no more land available, this can be accomplished only by rendering the existing land more productive, involving the application of more labour to the soil. A portion of the seventy persons heretofore engaged in the production of other things than food must transfer their labour to agriculture. There is still, therefore, enough food for all, and of a more agreeable kind; but there is a smaller production of other commodities. For a stationary population, therefore, the economic position is unaffected by the change. But then

no population is stationary ; and the same additional labour applied to the simpler but more productive form of agriculture would have increased the supply of food, which is the normal want in the actual state of the world with its increasing population. The condition involved is seen still more plainly if we assume that a part of the land is given up to the production of delicate fruits and wines, which tickle the palate, but are not a substitute for plainer food. In the production of champagne, for example, which requires a long time and continued attention to bring to perfection, the men engaged in the manufacture are fed from the surplus food of the agriculturist, just as much as the men engaged in writing books or painting pictures. In this respect the growth of champagne or the rearing of pheasants stands economically on the same ground as the production of any other commodities which are not food. The effect is neither better nor worse. But in so far as the production of richer foods, by taking up a portion of the available land, displaces a larger amount of simpler food which might otherwise have been grown upon it, it disturbs the equilibrium between the production of food and that of other things on the maintenance of which depends the prosperity of mankind, and serves to intensify that struggle for the available food supply which is always going on. Of all luxury, luxury in food is from this point of view the most baneful.

Of course this is not the only side of the question. The simplest food will not suffice to maintain a community in mental and physical health, and to produce the highest form of efforts. A people who live on rice will usually be found unfit to do anything better than grow rice. Monotony in food, as in other things, begets dulness. For all classes there must be something in life to look forward to if men are not to become soured ; and, constituted as we are at present, the pleasures of the table must continue to form an important element among the pleasures available for man. But if the use of luxurious food be defensible on these grounds, absolute waste of food, at any rate, produces the ill effect pointed out, without any compensating advantage. The diner at every gluttonous City feast contributes his quota to the already existing distress in some other part of the community. So does the guest at a charity dinner. The money he subscribes to the charity is merely a transfer of wealth which leaves the world neither richer nor poorer ; the dinner he eats or leaves increases the poverty of his neighbours.

It may be said, perhaps, that even waste has its uses ; the spectacle of luxury enjoyed by others may give a stimulus to labour and invention. But the speculations suggested by this vein of argument carry us far beyond the scope of the present contribution to the discussion of a great subject.

GEORGE CHESNEY.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE Irish Land Act, having passed through all its stages, received the Royal Assent on the 22nd of August. That brief sentence embodies the history of a long Session. Parliament, which met in the third week in January, has dispersed in the third week of August, without having done anything permanent save the passing of the Land Act. It sanctioned the coercion of Ireland, but the Peace Preservation Acts were temporary expedients, whereas the Land Act effects a permanent revolution. The former closed, let us hope, the dismal era of repression; the latter opens a new era in which England for the first time gives full effect to those principles from which alone can there be any hope of contentment and tranquillity in Ireland. Great as has been the waste of time, and wearisome beyond description the tedious task of propelling the Bill through Parliament, no one can describe a Session which has remodelled the agrarian legislation of an entire country as wasted. It has, on the contrary, been more fruitful in the true sense of the word than any of the Sessions during which the Beaconsfield Cabinet pottered on over the permissive legislation which added so many dead letters to the statute book. The Session in which the Irish Land Act became law will fill an important place in history, nor will its importance be materially diminished because that measure is the only outcome of Parliamentary activity.

The Irish Land Act differs from the Irish Land Bill when it was first introduced to the House of Commons in several important particulars. In its passage through the House of Commons it was materially improved; while the hostile criticism of the House of Lords did not succeed in impairing a single vital principle. 1. The attempt to define the grounds upon which the new Court should settle what constitutes a fair rent was abandoned. The discretion of the Land Court is not limited by the Act, subject to the general direction, to have regard to the respective interests of landlord and tenant, and to the stipulation that the purchase money paid for the tenant right shall not, apart from other considerations, be deemed a ground either for reducing or for increasing the rent of a holding. 2. Leases extorted from the tenant by threats of eviction, in order to evade the principle of the Act of 1870, can be brought before the Land Court and quashed. The leaseholder in that case, like all leaseholders whose leases expire before 1941, will be able to apply to the Court for the statutory fifteen years renewable lease which it is the chief object of the first part of the Act to create. 3. Provision has been made

for the payment of arrears incurred within the last three bad years by advances from the State, to be repaid in a long series of small annual instalments. 4. Two clauses have been added to the Bill for the purpose of facilitating the erection of labourers' dwellings. Tenants with the consent of the Court are to be allowed to erect houses for their labourers, and provision is made for the granting of small loans for that purpose. 5. The purchase clauses were amended so as to authorise, in special cases sanctioned by the Treasury, the advance of money for the purchase of estates, when only one-half instead of three-fourths of the tenants wish to buy. 6. The landlord equally with the tenant is allowed access to the Court, where he has demanded an increase of rent, or shall have otherwise failed to agree as to what constitutes a fair rent. 7. The emigration clauses have been so cut down that no greater sum than £200,000 is to be advanced for that purpose. Nor must more than a third of it be advanced in any single year. In addition to these changes, numerous minor alterations have been made. The half-dozen estates managed on English principles—if indeed there be so many—have been exempted from the provisions of the Bill. Wild duck, widgeon, and teal, have been transferred from the tenant to the landlord. In the Commons the tendency of the small amendments was to enlarge, and in the Lords to restrict, the scope of the Bill. But on the whole, in the opinion of its author, the Bill as it finally received the Royal assent was a far better Bill, better for the tenant and more likely to produce a pacifying effect in Ireland, than the Bill as he originally laid it on the table of the House of Commons.

The closing scenes of the parliamentary debates on the Bill were enlivened by a sudden and unexpected demonstration of the existence of the House of Lords. The reminder was unwelcome to the country and dangerous to the Peers. The right of the Upper Chamber to mutilate or to reject measures which the representatives of the nation demand, is constitutionally as indisputable as the right of the Sovereign to withhold the Royal assent to measures which have received the approval of Parliament. In the latter case the right is allowed to exist, because it is not exercised. In the former, the limits within which its exercise is tolerated is growing narrower every year, and it is on that account that the constitutional paradox is tolerated by the nation. That is to say, the constitutional paradox is tolerated because, for the most part, it is a constitutional fiction. The House of Lords has not yet fully learned the lesson which Lord Salisbury, when he was a member of the House of Commons, stated with so much vigour twenty-three years since. It has not recognised that its independence has long been "destroyed for ever," and that the position is "very similar to that of the old Parliaments of Paris," but it is haunted by an ever-growing suspicion that such

is the fact, and the timidity and self-effacement which this encourages is the surest guarantee for its continued existence. The position of the Peers is, however, exceedingly anomalous, and they are naturally tempted to keep the anomaly of their existence in countenance, by creating another anomaly by the assertion of their authority. When the Land Bill first went up to the Second Chamber, it seemed as if the Peers were disposed to bow to the inevitable, and acquiesce in legislation which they detested, but which they dare not reject. Instead of voting against the Bill in the second reading, they contented themselves with anathematizing it, with a whole-hearted ferocity. Lord Salisbury and Lord Lytton fulminated against the Bill a broadside of denunciations so sweeping and unsparing as to recall the curses heaped on the jackdaw of Rheims. If his words had any meaning, and constitutional fiction had really been constitutional fact, Lord Salisbury ought to have divided against the second reading of so iniquitous and mischievous a measure. Here, on the one hand, was a Bill which, in its essence, he declared was opposed to all sound principle, which was flagrantly dishonest in its proposals, and which, moreover, was certain to plunge Ireland into anarchy and barbarism. On the other there was a branch of the legislature, possessed of co-ordinate jurisdiction and co-equal power with that of the House in which the legislative monster had originated, a House which was charged with the duty of operating as a check upon the mischievous activity of the Commons, and whose special functions Lord Robert Cecil had declared to be the protection of the property of the rich from the attacks of the representatives of the poor. As certainly as fire is extinguished by water, so certainly should the House of Lords have rejected the Land Bill if there had been any reality in the Conservative denunciations of the Bill, or any truth in the Constitutional fiction that the House of Lords possesses an equal voice in legislation with the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, the declamations of the Conservative Peers were as hollow as the Constitutional pretensions of the House of Lords were obsolete. The result was what might have been anticipated. The majority of the Peers sanctioned a Bill which they declared they regarded as mischievous, and by the extravagance of their declamatory rhetoric put a formidable weapon in the hand of any future Ministry bent upon compelling the Peers to sanction measures of Radical reform. For the speech and policy of Lord Salisbury afford a precedent which the popular party is not likely to forget as proving that no intensity of conviction as to the mischievousness of any measure is, in itself, a sufficient reason for its rejection by the House of Peers. The action of that House is determined by other reasons than the wisdom, the justice and the policy of the measures submitted to its consideration, and a Chamber which could read a second time without a division a Bill which a

majority of its members believed to be as immoral, unjust, and impolitic as the Land Bill was described by Lord Salisbury and Lord Lytton, can never afterwards plead conscientious conviction as a reason for refusing compliance with the national will.

One of the most mischievous attributes of the House of Lords is the power it possesses of amending, or in other words, of mutilating measures which it dare not reject. If, like the Crown, it merely possessed a right of veto, its influence would be much less pernicious. This is illustrated by the comparatively innocuous influence of the Peers in all questions relating to finance. On financial questions they have a veto, but nothing else. They can throw out a Money Bill, they cannot amend it. As a consequence they have done less mischief in the domain of finance than in any other department of domestic legislation. The Land Bill unfortunately came within the category of those measures which the Lords may amend in committee. Stung by a sense of the ludicrous inconsistency between their speeches and their votes in the second reading, the Peers, not daring to throw out the Bill as a whole, made war upon its component clauses. If the dogma of Papal infallibility had been sent down for revision to the General Assembly of the Free Kirk, it would have received as appreciative a handling as that extended to Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill by Lord Salisbury's majority. They struck one of the three F's, Fixity, out of the Bill altogether, they placed limits and restrictions on the exercise of Free Sale, and they did their best to render it possible to increase a tenant's rent upon his own improvements. When the Bill was sent back to the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone met the Lords' Amendments in a spirit of conciliation. He rejected eight or nine, and either accepted outright or offered concessions on an equal number. The Bill went back to the Lords on the 12th of August, and to the astonishment of all, Lord Salisbury, instead of making capital out of the concessions which he had succeeded in wringing from the Prime Minister, assumed an attitude of defiance which, for a time, threatened to wreck the Bill altogether. Amendment after amendment was insisted on, the concessions offered by the Commons were rejected, and England woke up on Saturday morning to find itself on the verge of a perilous constitutional crisis. It is difficult to say whether the Conservatives were more alarmed or the Liberals more indignant. The former saw with unfeigned dread the prospect of a constitutional collision from which the prerogatives of the Peers were not likely to emerge intact. Irish Peers, dismayed at the prospect of another winter under the rule of the Land League, besieged Lord Salisbury with protests against persistence in a course which would involve the loss of the Bill. On the other hand the Liberals, while full of dismay at the possibility of having to govern Ireland without

the Land Bill, were not without a certain gleeful delight that at last the Reactionary Chamber had challenged a contest which could only result in the permanent weakening of an institution which for the last fifty years has been a continued incubus upon the cause of reform. Ministers met on Saturday and determined to stand firm. To afford the Lords a way of retreat, they decided to sacrifice Mr. Parnell's amendment, staying sales under writ of execution for debt or damages pending the three months during which a judicial rent might be fixed, and to make over to the landlord the wild duck, widgeon, and teal, which the Lords insisted should be classed as game. On all the other points they determined to meet the Lords with courteous but resolute refusal. On Monday, Liberal Associations throughout the country were on the alert. Telegrams by the hundred poured into Downing Street adjuring the Ministry to stand firm. A representative meeting of delegates from the Associated Liberal Unions met at Westminster Palace Hotel, and after urging the Government not to yield one jot or tittle of the Bill to the Lords, decided to hold meetings in all the constituencies to support ministers in their resistance to the pretensions of the House of Lords. Precedents dating from the time of the Commonwealth were referred to amid cheers, and the name of the Lord Protector was heard once more as the watchword of those who obeyed the summons to do battle for the rights of the people against the privileges of the Peers. Preparations were made at a moment's notice all over the country to hold great meetings to demand "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill" when it was noised abroad that the Peers had decided to give way. The rumour proved to be correct. The House of Commons repelled with indignation the amendments on which the Lords had insisted. Even widgeon, duck, and teal were not surrendered without a protest, and the abandonment of Mr. Parnell's amendment led the Extreme Left to vote against the Government. If Mr. Gladstone had proposed the rejection *en bloc* of all the Lords' amendments, he would have better pleased the rising temper of his supporters. Nothing, however, could be more judicious and conciliatory than his action. Without yielding a single point of importance, he left such an impression of reasonableness and conciliation, that his more unscrupulous opponents declared he had hoisted the white flag, while the more reckless of the Parnellites were equally vehement in asserting that he had mutilated his Bill. As a matter of fact, with the exception of the wild fowl clause and the amendment staying executions pending the fixing of a judicial rent, nothing was surrendered, and the Bill went back to the Peers practically intact. The interval for reflection had not been thrown away. The amendments on which they had on the previous Monday been determined "boldly and

manfully" to resist, they surrendered without a protest, and the Bill became law.

In the midst of the excitement occasioned by the brief crisis, one dark thought weighed on the mind even of the most optimist of Ministerialists. If the worst came to the worst and the Lords were to force an appeal to the country, what would be the result in Ireland? In Scotland and Wales the Liberals would have held their own. In England, the alienation of a portion of the Irish electorate by the Coercion Act and the loss of a few alike of Mr. Bradlaugh's supporters and of his opponents, would probably have reduced, although not materially, the majority that was returned in 1880. But in Ireland the Liberal party would have been simply obliterated. "Mr. Parnell," said one of the most sanguine of the organizers of the Westminster Palace Conference, "would return his sticks and umbrellas for all the constituencies of Ireland;" and less figurative, but not less serious persons have estimated that, in the event of an immediate dissolution, the Party of Action would come back eighty strong. This is probably an exaggeration, but by the universal admission of all parties, there is no doubt that a general election would sweep away almost every Irish Liberal and not a few Irish Conservatives. It is difficult enough to govern Ireland with a dozen or a score thoroughgoing Parnellites in the House of Commons. If their numbers were increased to fifty or three-score the situation would become intolerable. Such, however, is the prospect which lies before the Cabinet which has just sent the message of peace to Ireland. The political effects of that message are not capable of immediate realisation, and at present they are neutralised by the mischievous effects of that other message, which the Government were so ill-advised as to send them at the opening of the Session. With the Coercion Act in full force, with Kilmainham full of untried prisoners, and with the "Father of the Land League" in a convict prison, it is idle to talk of the gratitude which should be expected from the Irish people. In time the Land Act will tell, but the irritation produced by the exercise of arbitrary power intensifies the local inflammation to a point which, for the time, is likely to obscure the healing effect of the Message of Peace.

The debate on the working of the Coercion Act which took place in August, together with that which was raised by Mr. Parnell on the arrest of Michael Davitt, will tend to convince all dispassionate minds that, excepting for the urgent necessity under which the Prime Minister lay of keeping his party together, coercion has been a costly mistake. It was justified when it was first adopted on two grounds. It was alleged that it would put a stop to outrages, and that it would break the back of the Land League. It has not put

a stop to outrages, and it has not broken the back of the Land League. The Land Leaguers would probably carry two-thirds of the Irish seats to-morrow; and as for outrages, while their number has slightly diminished their gravity has increased. From October to February both inclusive, Mr. Forster told the House of Commons on the 18th inst. there had been 995 agrarian outrages. Thus during the winter months, when the nights were longest, and the peasantry were smarting under the dread of unjust evictions against which the Government was powerless to shield them owing to the refusal of the Lords to pass the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in the preceding Session, the outrages averaged 199 per month. From March to the end of August, calculating that the outrages in the last-named month will be double those committed in the first half, there have been 975 outrages, or an average of 162 per month. The last six months were those of spring and summer, when the nights were shortest and the peasantry busiest, and when the introduction of the Land Bill had given them hope of legal protection for the fruit of their labour, yet instead of outrages ceasing altogether they only fell off 37 per month, a diminution which might naturally have been expected from the season of the year. But although the outrages by the peasants fell off 37 per month, the official outrages legalised by the Coercion Acts began to increase. In little more than five months, 209 unconvicted men were arrested by the Lord Lieutenant's warrant, and clapped into gaol. The arbitrary arrests, therefore, almost exactly corresponded to the diminution in outrages. Nor was that all. While the minor forms of agrarian crime fell off, agrarian murders once more reappeared. In February there was one such crime, in March there was another, in April there were two, and in May no less than three. The futility of arbitrary arrests to suppress the excesses which naturally accompany even the most legitimate agrarian agitation, could hardly be more conclusively demonstrated, and English Liberals have only too much reason to lament that they abandoned the attempt to govern Ireland on popular principles, in order to snatch at a fleeting and illusive prospect of an immediate suppression of agrarian disorder.

On the 8th of August the government of the Transvaal State was handed over to the representatives of the Boers, pending the ratification of the Convention of the Volksraad. If that act of renunciation had taken place exactly twelve months before, one of the most painful chapters in the annals of the present Ministry would never have been written. That it did not take place twelve months before was primarily due to Sir Bartle Frere, that evil genius of South Africa, who, by urgent telegram from the Cape declaring war to be imminent unless immediate Ministerial notification was given of the

intention of England to retain possession of the Transvaal, precipitated a decision on insufficient evidence, which had subsequently to be painfully reversed when the real facts came to light. The refusal to recall that "prancing proconsul" has indeed been bitterly avenged. Even after that initial mistake had been made, it was still possible to have avoided war, and to have maintained the pledges extorted by Sir Bartle Frere. The terms of the Convention under which the Transvaal was restored to the Boers are not inconsistent with the retention of the State as part of the British Empire. Under the veil of suzerainty, the Home Government has reserved for itself a far more effective control over the foreign policy and domestic administration of the Boers than it can exercise in such self-governing colonies as Canada and the Cape of Good Hope. The more that remarkable document is studied the more obvious must appear the folly, or rather the ignorance, which led to the attempt to force upon the Boers not the recognition of the sovereignty of the Queen and the control of their native policy, but that arbitrary system of English rule which is known as the Government of a Crown Colony.

Ministers on their accession to office approached all these questions from a wrong standpoint. Instead of assuming, as they were fully justified in doing from the position which they had taken up in Opposition, that the policy of the late Government was radically wrong and must be reversed, wherever and whenever it was possible so to do, without endangering the peace and safety of the empire, they seem to have proceeded upon the opposite tack of endeavouring to preserve as much of the policy of their predecessors as they could without flagrant violation of their electoral programme. The result of this we have seen in the Transvaal and in Afghanistan. A prompt reversal of the Conservative policy, and an immediate withdrawal from responsibilities which we had no right or reason to undertake would have spared us two bloody battles in Asia and three defeats in Africa.

Even at this hour we are liable to be involved in the hostilities which accompany the general election now going on for the post of Ameer in the interior of Afghanistan. Despite all promises of evacuation our troops still occupy Pishin. Ayoub has seized Candahar after defeating the army of his rival Abdur Rahman, but the result of the struggle for power still trembles in the balance. If the expected battle near Kelat-i-Ghilzie gives the throne of Afghanistan to Ayoub, we shall not have long to wait before he demands the withdrawal of our garrisons from Southern Afghanistan. To make such a demand is sufficient to secure its rejection, and once more delay in the execution of the programme of the Government may lead to the reversal of its policy.

In Zululand the same unfortunate hesitancy to annul the acts of the late administration is perceptible in the disturbance among our

puppet chieftains, which General Wood is endeavouring to compose by the peace-making presence of British Hussars. It is evident the arrangement of the division of Zululand will not work. Eight out of thirteen of the tribal chiefs have petitioned for the return of Cetewayo. He, at least, could answer for order among his own people. But Cetewayo is not to be sent back. He was unjustly dethroned, but not until the situation becomes as serious as those in the Transvaal is there any prospect that he will be righted. If that should happen, South Africa will a second time witness what might have been a great act of righteous restitution degraded into a surrender dictated by selfishness and fear.

The same hesitancy is perceptible nearer home in the case of the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Ministers, from Mr. Gladstone downwards, denounced that Convention in unmeasured terms, and in truth they could hardly denounce it more severely than it deserved. But, although they have been eighteen months in office, they have not taken the initial step towards disembarassing themselves of the crushing responsibility of that insane Convention. Cyprus, they say, blocks the way. But is there no way of extricating ourselves from Cyprus? Surely if there were a will there would soon be a way. What is there to prevent the discontinuance of our occupancy and the establishment of a local autonomous government in the island, similar to that which exists in Eastern Roumelia? The Sultan has no power to harm a single Bulgarian in Eastern Roumelia; and if a similar arrangement were established in Cyprus, the Cypriotes would be equally free from the pressure of Turkish misrule. The twenty-third article of the Treaty of Berlin offers an opportunity for establishing a system of government in Cyprus which will really serve as an example or working model for the other provinces of the Empire. Yet, although this way of escape is open, nothing is done, and our occupation of Cyprus continues to be cited as sufficient justification for every high-handed act of aggression, at the expense of the Turk, which is executed or contemplated in Africa or Asia.

There is but sufficient space left to allude in the most cursory fashion to the great European event of the month, the issue of the General Election in France. On Sunday, the 21st of August, three nations in the west of Europe chose their rulers for the next three or four years. Every constituency in France, Spain, and Portugal went to the poll. Before midnight the nature of the national choice was substantially ascertained. This enormous vote, decisive of the immediate future of the destinies of three nations, was cast without the slightest disorder. Frenchmen are excitable and Spaniards are quick to take offence, but there does not appear to have been, throughout the length and breadth of the two countries, a single riot, such as those as were of constant occurrence

in England before the ballot, and which even secret voting has not entirely eradicated from our electoral experiences. Democracy in its latest manifestations has at least secured the triumph of order in the exercise of the national sovereignty. In Madrid the elections took place under a sun which caused the thermometer to register 36 degrees centigrade in the shade; in Paris the day was bright, and many electors voted in the morning on the way to their rural outing, returning at night to ascertain the result of the poll. There was some excitement in the Spanish capital over the discovery of an extensive Conservative conspiracy to personate, and in Paris, the struggle in Belleville naturally occasioned much feeling, but there does not seem to have been as much disorder in both capitals combined as not unfrequently disgraces a single English borough. Whatever may be said of their results, the order which characterized this simultaneous appeal to the people from Calais to Gibraltar is a reassuring indication of the progress of popular intelligence and self-control.

Of the result of the Spanish elections but little need be said. The Ministry has triumphed, as Spanish Ministries always triumph. Signor Sagasta will be supported in the new Cortez by a majority as compact as that which supported Señor Canovas del Castillo, in its predecessor. There seems to have been no arbitrary interference with the electors; but, as usual, the Ministerial candidates were elected all over Spain. The Conservatives secured from forty to fifty seats. Señor Castelar, with the aid of the Ministry, will represent a little group of eleven Possibilists, while eight members are classified as belonging to the other Republican sections. The Liberal majority is 300 strong. The most interesting feature of the election, as it is almost the only one in which the free choice of the electors made itself felt, was the preference shown for Liberal Ministerialists as distinguished from the Liberal Conservatives who support the Ministry; more than 200 Constitutional Liberals are said to have been elected, as against 60 or 70 of the Conservative supporters of Marshal Martinez Campos, whose influence in the Fusionist Cabinet must be correspondingly weakened. Señor Sagasta will be strengthened in his tendency in favour of religious liberty by the result of the election, but there is little danger that the most advanced Sagastans will hurry the Spanish Ministry into that warfare with Clericalism which Señor Castelar laments as a temporary aberration of Liberalism north of the Pyrenees.

The elections in France are of immeasurably greater importance than those in the Peninsula. They denote the first complete and pacific triumph of the Republic. Hitherto the Republican party has been a party of combat. It had to struggle to preserve the Republic which it had founded against the attacks of a formidable coalition of Monarchists and Bonapartists. That stage is now past.

The era of combat is over. The period of possession has begun. For the first time since the fall of the Empire the Republican party has no longer to face an opposition hostile to the Republican constitution. There will still be Monarchists and Bonapartists in the Chamber, but as an opposition they no longer exist. They have been crushed at the poll. The returns are still incomplete, but it is estimated that one-half of the anti-Republicans of the late Chamber have lost their seats. The overwhelming victory of the Republicans, all along the line from Belfort to Corsica, is the first result of the French election. The second, which, if we recall the fears expressed ten years ago as to the European peril arising from French Socialism, will seem even more reassuring than the discomfiture of the monarchical factions, is the complete effacement of the Socialists. In Paris 195,000 electors voted for Republican candidates. Only 25,000 supported the candidature of the Collectivist Socialists. Not a single representative of this group, which was once so formidable, will find a seat in the new Chamber. Without asserting with the *Temps* that the Socialist revolutionary party no longer exists in France, we may at least congratulate our neighbours across the Channel upon the remarkable progress made in the study of practical politics, which enables them to substitute for the idle dreams of visionary enthusiasts the sober aspirations of serious thinkers.

Apart from the effacement of the two mutually hostile and equally irreconcilable extremes of the Monarchy and of the Commune, the interest of the election centres upon the position in which it places M. Gambetta. The General Election has been for him at once a triumph and a reverse. It has crowned with complete success the enterprise to which he has devoted his life, but it accompanied that crowning triumph with a galling personal discomfiture. The Second Arrondissement of Belleville plays the rôle of the slave in the Roman triumph. France has come over to the side of the candidate whom Belleville returned in 1869, but Belleville has well-nigh shaken off her allegiance to M. Gambetta. The Parisian elections proved that, while M. Gambetta was able to keep his seat, his place as leader of the Republicans of the capital has fallen to the lot of M. Clemenceau. Out of the 195,000 votes given to Republican candidates in Paris, 105,000, or more than half, were recorded for Republicans—Radical rather than Opportunist—of the uncompromising type of M. Clemenceau, rather than of the practical politicians who favour M. Gambetta. Of the ultimate effect of this change in the leadership of French democracy it is too soon yet to speak. It is sufficient to say that it facilitates rather than impedes the accession of M. Gambetta to office as the ruler of France.

THE

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CLXXVIII. NEW SERIES.—OCTOBER 1, 1881.

REFORM IN PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE present article is intended to be a continuation of that on the business of Parliament which appeared last year in this Review. That article sought to investigate the means which would enable the House of Commons to do its work more thoroughly; this proposes to examine the means whereby the House of Lords may attain the same object. As things now stand, the Peers are in a position satisfactory neither to themselves nor to the nation. Possessing, as it will be allowed that many of them do, a large share of political ability, they yet complain, and not without reason, that they have little to do. The country, on the other hand, is heard to murmur that if the Lords have little to do, they fail to perform that little well; that they so deal with measures originated in their House as to lay on the Commons the burthen of doing everything over again; that they are not in accord with contemporary thought, as expressed in the majority of general elections; that in consequence of all these failings, they do more to hinder than to help or guide legislation. The complaints of both parties are consistent with each other and with truth; and it is worth endeavouring to meet them by certain changes in the organization of the Upper House. What it is proposed to accomplish sensible men of all parties agree in desiring, and it may be accomplished by reforms at once Conservative and Liberal, since the durability of an institution must in our time be measured by its efficiency. It is not necessary to inquire whether the principle of an hereditary Chamber can be justified in speculation, or to divine its fate in the constitutional history of a remote future. It is enough that in living England there works in its favour a strong sentiment, or, if you will, an inveterate prejudice. Every one is aware of the preference obtained by youthful members of the nobility in elections to the House of Commons, and

of the monopoly which they may be said to possess of an *early* entrance into that assembly. Such an attitude as the Peers for a time assumed with regard to their amendments on the Irish Land Act of the late session, such a temper as they displayed in their rejection of the Irish Registration Bill of the session before, may seem designed to court destruction; for in both cases they betrayed a want of that dignity and wisdom so indispensable in an Upper Chamber. But they may rest well assured that, if they do not commit suicide, they need not fear speedy abolition. To abolish is not the English political method.

The necessity is urgent. We are at this moment engaged in a struggle almost for very life with other nations, who in becoming free have also become vigorous, intelligent, and progressive. We must put forth all our strength if we are to maintain our rank in commerce, manufactures, and agriculture, as well as that which is most precious, our proud place as the model of free and beneficent institutions. We cannot suffer any member of the Constitution, whether for a short or long period, to remain defective and crippled. The House of Lords exists, has root in the national feeling; how can it attain its due efficacy as a part of the legislature? This problem must be solved by such reforms as will furnish the House with that practical information, those opportunities, and those powers without which it cannot do its work, and which it does not now possess; by such reforms as will establish a more constant and intimate connection between itself as legislating and those who have to administer and obey the laws, and thus impart to it a more active sympathy with the interests, feelings, desires, and hopes of the great body of the nation. The Lords do not now debate the Bills laid on their table in such a manner as either to draw the attention or educate the opinion of the country. They do not derive from those whom the laws under consideration most affect the suggestions necessary to make laws practical. They resist without sympathy, they yield without conviction, and therefore with infinite loss of self-respect and of legitimate influence.

It is in reference to reforms for Ireland that their action has been most unwise and most unfortunate. Mr. Escott, in the main their panegyrist, says in his interesting book on England, vol. ii. p. 190, "In 1859 the Liberal majority in the House of Commons could have carried absolute fixity of tenure in the Irish Land Act, but it was known that the House of Lords, as an assemblage of landowners, would not submit to such a clause, and it was consequently deemed impracticable to pursue the idea." Whilst a more severe critic, the author of the pamphlet entitled "Fifty Years of the House of Lords," produces a formidable list of instances in which the Lords, either by direct action or by indirect influence, delayed remedial measures so

long, that when they came, they came too late to conciliate Ireland or to rebut the charge that they were extorted by sedition. He observes, p. 14, "that no small portion of the difficulties of Irish government have arisen from the inability of the English people to secure the acceptance of just laws for Ireland by the House of Lords, until long after the opportunity had passed when concession might have been efficacious in removing discontent." And the keenest opponent of English rule in Ireland glories in the thought that concessions which would have once been accepted as a settlement probably now come too late. Mr. Dillon, as reported in the *Standard* of August 29th, expressed himself thus concerning the second Irish Land Act: "He wished it to be distinctly understood that he never said this Bill would not confer immense benefits on the Irish people, benefits which their fathers in 1852 would have thought invaluable, and would have thanked their oppressors for having given, though, thank God, they stood now in different times." Thus it should seem that the action of the Peers relative to Irish questions has done as much to forward the views of those who aim at the separation, as to thwart the wishes of those who would preserve the union of the two kingdoms.

As the Lords are now constituted, they do not so much legislate as register, and often with a bad grace, the decrees of the House of Commons. But a Second Chamber should do more than record the resolutions of the First; it should complete and harmonize the whole of legislation. In order to do this it must be capable of a lively and intelligent sympathy with the nation at large; and we cannot too often repeat that the creation of this sympathy should be the reformer's prime object.

In the solution of our present problem let us begin by trying to conceive clearly the ends which should be subserved by a Second Chamber. We shall then be able to see how far the House of Lords at present attains those ends, and how far it stands in need of reform. Roughly speaking, the ends for which a Second Chamber should exist are three.

(1.) To check impulsive legislation. In this country Parliament seldom decides on great questions which have not been long agitated in the country. Yet its final decision is often given in haste and excitement. As now constituted, the House of Lords only aggravates the evil. Often it opposes from the mere habit of opposition; and by an unwise and pettish negative inflames the people instead of teaching it to reflect. This is the more to be regretted because the leisured class, the informal constituency of a Second Chamber, are precisely those who could and should look furthest into the future, and should be least tempted to seek immediate advantages by means ultimately mischievous.

(2.) To be a lasting guard against laws passed to satisfy an interested and active minority of the nation. Such a minority may be powerful enough to turn the scale of elections in which the two great parties are almost evenly balanced. It may then impose its wishes upon a reluctant majority. To prevent such a misfortune is a most important function of the Second Chamber. How important will be understood by all who have watched the working of American politics during the last forty years; who have seen how the need of conciliating compact and selfish minorities made it hard, at one time almost impossible, for an honest man to be a politician; how large a share it had in making possible a growth of local taxation almost equivalent (as in the city of New York) to confiscation, and in making impossible the peaceable settlement of those difficulties which led to the great civil war. A House of Lords which should discharge this duty well and wisely would by that service alone fully justify its existence.

(3.) To assist the First Chamber in elaborating the details of measures. An Upper House may do this either by preparing measures in the first instance for subsequent consideration by the Lower, or by itself revising measures which have come thence. For reasons to be stated presently, the House of Lords, as it now stands, cannot properly discharge this office.

These functions the House of Lords can never discharge as it should until it feels more confidence in its own strength, and inspires more belief in its own practical knowledge. As an instrument of legislation it labours under two capital weaknesses. In the first place it does not bring to its deliberations either the command of detail or the feeling of responsibility for labour so needed in a legislator; in the second place it is often out of harmony with the House of Commons and with public opinion. The second of these evils attracts more attention and excites more ill-will; but the first, as no less important and too much neglected, must first and chiefly engage us here.

In order that the aristocracy and the House of Lords may render that service to the community by which alone they can justify to a democratic age their continued existence, they must adopt a better division of labour. So long as men inherit legislative power there must be some lawgivers who have neither inclination nor aptitude for their task. Such men may in many ways do good and exert influence; for a nobility is not limited to purely political functions. They may be generous landlords, benefactors of their neighbourhood, examples of cultivation and refinement, graceful leaders of county society, and active partakers in county administration; but they can scarcely be efficient members of a legislative assembly. They have not undergone the discipline of a laborious political apprenticeship.

They are not familiar with the vast complexity of interests affected by almost all important measures. When they hasten to swell the numbers of a momentous division, they too often do so under an excitement which affords no time for reflection. Too often they are led by unwise and impetuous leaders into positions dangerous to their own order, embarrassing to everybody else, impossible to be maintained with dignity or abandoned without peril. If, then, the House of Lords is to be efficient for legislation, such of its members as are more fitted for other functions should not be forced to take part in labours which they decline to execute with care.

As for that large body of Peers who are really able and eager to legislate, if we are to get the full benefit of their statesmanlike qualities, we must place them in more intimate correspondence with their fellow-citizens, and awaken in them a more lively feeling of responsibility. All fair observers will allow that, in the present position of affairs, the Lords have no adequate inducement or opportunity to show what they can perform. In the *Nineteenth Century* for August, a critic whom we cannot suppose prejudiced against that House of which he will one day be a member, complains that it fulfils no function save that of inaugurating barren debates on matters of general policy, that it adopts towards every new idea a carping tone most discouraging to those who promote legislation, and that it is in danger of sinking to the level of the House of Convocation. One of the most eloquent of living orators, in answer to the complaint that the Lords did not debate sufficiently in Committee the Bills originating in their House, admitted the fact most frankly. He said that, except on a few full-dress debates, he always felt that he was considered a bore if he spoke for more than a very few minutes, and that his hearers were thinking less of what he was saying than of their imperilled dinner. And if this is the case with one capable of enchaining his hearers, what must be the feeling of able but less eloquent Peers who, though they may be practically acquainted with evils and can show how those evils may be cured, can only impart to their subject the charm of matter-of-fact clearness. Yet such men are among the most useful any legislature can possess.

The attendance in the House of Lords is generally small. The debates, for the most part mere conversations, are short, informal, and, therefore, not easy to be comprehended by the public. No wonder that the nation cares little about discussions in which the speakers themselves seem uninterested. Even those who most chafe against the general inactivity in time come to feel its spell. In the Lower House most able members of the Upper have been formed. But how many promising public men have been spoilt or buried by an early transference from the House where they had by toil to win and keep the public esteem to that House in which they were not constrained

to do either; to that House where industry could find no field and labour could reap no fruit; to that House which Lord Beaconsfield in one of his happiest touches likened to the restful Elysian Fields.

Were the House of Lords much more diligent than it can ever be under the present system, it would find all its efforts hampered for want of information. That its members, as compared with those of the Lower House, have in their own persons a less varied experience of men and affairs, is but the least part of their misfortune. The worst is that they have no constituents. Men who are born to riches and honour are not always born to that sympathy with their fellows which is the key to true knowledge. Their best chance of becoming acquainted with the common man is the necessity of conciliating his good opinion. From that necessity the Peers are exempt. But in not having constituents they lose much more than this. They have to make laws without being able to derive knowledge from those whom the laws will affect. Laws as first conceived by the legislator are no more applicable to practice than mechanical contrivances as they first flash on the mind of the inventor. By the suggestions of those who have to use the machine and obey the law, both the one and the other are adapted to our necessities. Those interested in the subject receive from their representative printed copies of the Bill, read the debates, and from their practical experience furnish suggestions for its amendment, which, in turn, undergo the scrutiny of the House. Thus he who sits in the House of Commons for an important constituency has the benefit of all that his constituents know and feel on matters of importance. Sometimes, no doubt, he may receive more information than he can use. He may be vexed with contradictory or meaningless counsel. But, if he does his duty as a representative, he undergoes a compulsory education eminently calculated to fit him for legislating. Provided with special knowledge, he can discuss great measures in a fruitful manner; what he says is criticised by men of varied experience; and if he does not do justice to the interests of his constituents, they are only too ready to murmur, and, if necessary, to cashier him. Every Bill laid on the table of the House of Commons finds members, who have the ability and the inducement, to improve it. Hence a constant canvassing of ideas which, by giving interest to the debates, makes them known to the public, and so indirectly as well as directly tends to their improvement. If this is so even now, much more will it be so when, by a better regulation of its business, the House is fully restored to self-respect and to the national confidence. But the Lords have no constituents to give them knowledge and to hold them answerable for the use of it. They have neither the special information nor the impulse to acquire it. And so long

as this is the case, their discussions on legislation non-contentious, but important, cannot either fix the attention or advance the welfare of their countrymen. The attempt to originate and complete great measures in their House has generally failed, and will fail until they so debate details as to save the House of Commons the necessity of debating them all anew.

Thus much concerning the one defect of the Upper House: the slight acquaintance of many of its members with the practical detail of legislation and their unconsciousness of an obligation to take pains. Of the other defect, a tendency to jar on the Lower House and on public opinion, we have no wish to say much, but we must say something. We need not fatigue our readers with a set proof of the proposition now familiar to everybody, that sovereignty, into however many parts it may be formally divided, must ever remain virtually one; nor need we stop to explain how that Parliamentary system which fell in 1832 satisfied this requisite by giving to one class and to one interest the preponderance in both Chambers; or to trace in detail how that interest remained supreme in the Upper House whilst, by repeated changes, it grew less powerful in the Lower. Since that old unity broke up, the House of Lords, as the representative of aristocracy, has at times been involved in hazardous conflict with the Lower as the representative of democracy, a struggle in which honourable victory is impossible and honourable retreat scarcely less so. But the Houses of Parliament should not represent particular and sometimes hostile interests. Both alike should represent the general interests of the nation. The Upper and Lower Houses should be, not the several organs of two distinct wills, but different organs of the same will. One should be the complement of the other and not its antagonist. So long as the two Houses continue to be the symbols of conflicting forces collisions between them must occur. In these collisions the greater force must prevail, and the popular force, symbolised by the Lower House, overbalance the aristocratic force symbolised by the Upper.

This does not imply the disappearance of the English nobility as leaders in public affairs; still less that the advantages of rank, whether real or conventional, have ceased to obtain respect. Where the transition to democracy takes place in a gradual and peaceable manner, where the Commons are proud of their past and the nobles are alive to the necessities of the present, those who once ruled will always be admitted to serve the state. But their power will not rest on the same foundation nor be itself the same. It must repose, not on the inherited faith, but on the rational conviction of the people. It must be employed, not so much to command as to guide them. Not in resisting, but in enlightening their will must it be principally manifested. The common people of all countries are only too jealous

of merit in their own ranks. Englishmen are easily led by those whom they are accustomed to respect. But the nobility of England will only continue to lead if they cease to be merely obstructive. To disdain influencing or leading those to whom you can no longer dictate, would be the height of petulant folly. To influence others is only possible on condition of understanding and of sympathising with their feelings and ideas. Does the staunchest Conservative expect long life and usefulness for the weaker Chamber when often clashing with the stronger. In such a posture of affairs does he find a school of liberality for the nobles or of deference for the Commons? Or does he think that the Peers act agreeably either with their own dignity, the interests of legislation, or the public repose, when they refuse with arrogance what the next moment they with weakness surrender?

If the failings of the House of Lords, under its present constitution, be such as above described, it will be readily conceived that the question of remedying these defects is a pressing one and within the range of practical politics. In all reforms of consequence we should, as far as possible, be guided by two principles: firstly, that of innovating only so far as is necessary to attain our end; and secondly, that of following, wherever it can be done, the lessons of our own or of other men's experience. It is to the test of these principles that we should bring the proposals already made for a reform of the House of Lords. The Marquis of Blandford, in the article already quoted, suggests two ways of modifying the hereditary principle. The first is to impose some new qualification of age and public service. This would, doubtless, remedy some defects in the present House of Lords. But it still leaves them too isolated and too weak for the thorough performance of their function. The second is to define two categories, the one including all eligible to the Upper House, the other all who should elect to it. The writer sketches a list of qualifications to either. The first, he suggests, might include the upper ranks of the military and civil services, judges of the High Courts, professors of any of the universities, and so forth; the second, all who paid rates above a certain amount, or enjoyed a certain professional income, or could furnish proof of having received a liberal education. We venture to think this proposal much less feasible than the other. It innovates on the largest scale and in a spirit peculiarly alien to the democracy of our own day, who are less jealous of all ancient than resolved to suffer no new privilege. Its innovations are condemned by the experience of our own colonies. A constituency of the wealthy and educated is strong enough to resist, but not to conquer, the constituency of household suffrage. Instead of allowing those classes to leaven the whole society, such an arrange-

ment bands them into a separate army with chiefs and aspirations of its own, in fact a plutocracy, than which nothing is more narrow and selfish. Lastly, it leaves them at once solitary, conspicuous, and unpopular—a mark for all the gathering discontent of the populace.

Sir David Wedderburn, in an article upon Second Chambers which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, gives as his opinion that “nomination for life or for a fixed period, by responsible ministers of the Crown, seems to be the best method hitherto invented for recruiting a senate which shall be in general harmony with popular sentiments, but superior to any transient popular impulse.” But in order to effect the desired end life peers must be nominated in great numbers, and even then, entering a House which as a whole remained in isolation, they would be more likely to imbibe than to transform its spirit. I think that in writing this sentence Sir David Wedderburn can hardly have recollected that the Senate of the United States, the most effective Second Chamber in the world, is not nominated but elected by the State Legislatures, and is wonderfully superior, not only to them, but also to the national House of Representatives; that it is the best-contrived and most successful part of the Constitution, and has frequently saved America from inconsiderate action, maintaining itself under a most democratic Government, and under severe strains. The experience of America seems to prove that secondary election is the best and simplest method of recruiting a Second Chamber.

The country wishes to maintain a Second Chamber; it also wishes to open it to the spirit of our time. It does not expect that it should change its views at every election, but it does expect that it should change them in accord with the gradual and irrevocable movement of national thought. For the attainment of these objects might not something be done in the following manner? Let the Peerage retain all that it now enjoys of rank and precedence, but let it appropriate to its diverse functions the diverse abilities of its members. Let it leave them free, if they so prefer, not to undertake the duty of making laws. Let all Peerages of the United Kingdom, as do now Peerages of the Scotch and Irish kingdoms, confer, not a seat in the House of Lords, but the capacity of filling such a seat. Let the House of Commons elect those Peers who shall actually sit; but not elect them all at once or in the ordinary manner. Of their total number, let each successive House of Commons elect by the cumulative vote one-third, say fifty Peers, who shall sit during three Parliaments, a period, on the average, of fifteen years. We might reserve to the Ministers the power of nominating a limited number of eminent civil and military servants of the Crown to sit in the Upper

House either for life or for a term of three parliaments. The present law lords would, of course, retain their seats. Finally, in order to connect the House of Lords with the nation and its whole system of local government, we might add the Chairmen of the new County Boards, when these last shall have been established. As the United Kingdom contains one hundred and fourteen counties, of which some might be grouped and others divided for purposes of administration, we may compute the number of Chairmen as about equal to the number of counties. Adding these to the one hundred and fifty elected peers, and making a moderate allowance for life-peers and for law-lords, we obtain a total of about three hundred members. More numerous a Second Chamber can scarcely with advantage be; and if the nominal Upper House of to-day exceeds this figure, its working numbers fall far below.

On this plan the change, though great, would be less, we believe, than any other capable of producing the result required. Hereditary Peers would still be in the majority; but they would be Peers who had sought election and had voluntarily assumed the responsibility of labour. They would be chosen by that method which, among a kindred people, has proved most propitious to merit; so chosen as to represent all shades of opinion in the House of Commons, that is to say, in the nation; so chosen as to eliminate the results of transient passion or caprice. Sitting for the space of half a generation, they would be independent enough for their own security and the common good. Amongst the Chairmen of County Boards and the members nominated by the Crown, many would have had seats under the old system; and all would be open to the traditions of a judicious conservatism. The reform would operate gradually, but, as we shall see, with the weightiest consequences.

It has been suggested as an alternative plan that the connection of the House of Lords with every part of the country might be even more thoroughly secured by dividing among the several counties in the ratio of their importance the total of Peers to be elected. They would then be chosen in each province by the cumulative votes of its representatives, both those who sit for the boroughs and those who sit for the county. The smaller counties, of course, would have to be grouped for the election of Peers. On this plan, the House of Lords would share with the House of Commons the closest union with each particular district, and every Peer would have constituents to convey to him their experience and ask his aid in forwarding every local or national interest. Such a scheme is certainly more complete than the one suggested above. But the latter has the advantage of apparently greater simplicity.

Whichever machinery we may adopt, the prime ends of reform

are equally served. These may be stated as a proper division of labour between the various members of the nobility; a consolidation of the imperial and local governments; and a substitution of regular and harmonious activity for the present painful and mischievous jars between the House of Peers and the Commons. We have already said, and must repeat, that a nobility has functions, not strictly political, yet worthy of the highest rank, the most exalted character, and the most distinguished talent. An instance or two will suffice to show how usefully this division of labour, according to disposition and ability, may act. One of our most ancient and noble houses now gives to the nation a leader both trusted and liked by the party he leads, and eagerly coveted by the party he opposes. In his brother he has a colleague and the country a Minister who fills a most difficult and delicate office with tact, industry, and firmness. Meanwhile scholarly culture and conciliating judgment have marked the chief of the family for head at once of one of our two great ancient Universities, and of the new one which is already itself doing useful work and stimulating to more vigorous life the older institutions. His energy has founded a new town, whose rapid growth in population and industry exceeds anything we have seen in this country, and rivals similar wonders in America. Yet no farmer or tradesman of his district is a more regular and painstaking guardian of the poor—more anxious to check at its source that pauperism which is one of the most dreaded and demoralising dangers of our labouring classes—more conscientiously industrious in every local duty. Lord Derby, too, has recently shown how even a leading statesman may find refreshment in exchanging imperial for local administration, and what by advice and example he may do on that less ambitious stage for the public service. Or to take an instance from one of our ancient families not yet ennobled except by usefulness. Will any one believe that the late Sir Baldwin Leighton could, as a member of the House of Commons, have rendered nobler service to the State than when, as a resident landowner and Chairman of his Board of Guardians, he, by wise and persistent firmness, counsel, and encouragement, almost annihilated pauperism, first in his own parish and then in the adjoining district; surrounded himself with thrifty and prosperous labourers, each with his deposit of £100 or so in the savings bank; and set an example which, as those interested in the subject know, has done much to improve the administration of the Poor Law and to reduce pauperism in town and country.

It must be remembered that legislative power under the new constitution of the Upper House would be enjoyed not only by those Peers who can command the suffrage of the Commons, but also by

those who have gained the confidence of any county. No Peer willing to work would be excluded because there was no room for him. If he were not found on the benches of the new House, it would be either because he preferred to serve his country elsewhere, or because he did not care to serve it anywhere. Those are no true friends of an aristocracy who would have it believe that in its bosom indolence and ignorance are safe at a time when everything has to justify itself to a critical democracy. If a privileged class is to endure, it must work with intelligence; it must apportion its members each to his proper task, relieving from the duty of making laws those who habitually shun it. By admitting the Chairmen of the proposed County Boards, we should not only strengthen the Upper House as an instrument of legislation, but we should also meet a great necessity of our time—the consolidation of our imperial with our local institutions.

Everybody is familiar with the defects of our local institutions; with the waste of public money occasioned by the number of petty authorities who, by dividing, elude responsibility; with the abstention from local government of many who might bring to its service leisure, ability, and varied experience; with the small result too often secured to the ratepayers, especially in small districts; with the unfortunate Conservatism which insists on referring to parliamentary matters only interesting to a single province or to a single neighbourhood; with the complete disconnection of the various local powers with each other, and the friction between them and the Imperial Government. It is not our present business to discuss reforms in local government, but it is well to see how such reforms, if undertaken on any adequate scale, would harmonize with the proposed reform of the Upper House. When the highest rank in the provincial shall open a way to a seat in the national council, men of talent and position will find a wider scope in local administration, and take a new interest in its labours. The tone of all local bodies will be raised; contact in a common service will unite all classes; connecting links will be formed between every district and every interest, as well as between the various branches of public service. A continuous ladder of political ascent will extend from the pettiest local board to the imperial legislature.

Should the present Government find leisure to undertake a plan for the adjustment of local taxation combined with the reform of local government, we may at length hope to see in each primary area, consolidated, improved, and carrying on their work in a way which makes possible the interest and control of those for whom they govern, a single council to deal with all matters best administered on such a primary area. When County Boards, elected in part or

wholly by such councils, discharge those functions which demand a wider area, then the head of the whole local system, the president of the County Board, would best connect it with the Second Chamber, and his rank might justly be an object of ambition to any man. Is it necessary to explain how the presence of such men so disciplined would add to the usefulness of the Upper House; how it would receive from them and bestow on them knowledge and power and dignity. Could we impart to the nation a more potent and beneficent impulse in the direction of a truly Conservative progress? Could we more thoroughly bind into a single whole every function of legislation and government, or better supply the Lords with an equivalent to the contact existing between the Commons and the country.

While thus advancing the work whose necessity the statesmen of all parties admit, the work of strengthening, simplifying, and elevating local government, the plan proposed offers a stimulus which may save many capable men from rotting in idleness. For in the moral as in the physical sphere, not to grow and to decay are one. It is the danger of an age like ours that whilst the people grow in wants and reflection, the idle and wealthy too often grow more wealthy and more idle. In our age every really useless class must fall into contempt and disappear. The more the field of legislation narrows by the gradual amelioration of our laws, the more does the work of administration rise in relative importance. It is therefore by returning to a more active guidance and service of the people in all branches of government that, in a democracy potentially so advanced as ours, the noble and wealthy can retain Conservative power, or even justify their existence. If they refuse this labour, the nobility which so long ruled the destinies of Britain may indeed survive, but they will survive as the *fainéant* nobility of Spain survived in the ignoble enjoyment of luxury without honour, and of wealth without power. All who feel this danger will see the advantage of welding the Upper House into one piece with the organization of local government throughout the country.

Nor need we fear the objection that by such reforms the Upper House would become too strong. Those who hold this language think, whether consciously or no, of an Upper House as the natural antagonist rather than as the fellow-labourer of the Lower. Too strong for its proper business neither the House of Commons nor the House of Lords can ever be. Of strength as the condition for efficiency and the result of usefulness we cannot have too much. Such strength we desire the Second Chamber to possess. But we believe that on the scheme sketched above it would be as indisposed to evil as it would be strong for good. It would be mighty to

execute, unwilling to resist, the deliberate will of the nation. A senate of whose members more than one-half must add to the privilege of birth the confidence of the representative House, and nearly another half must have won the suffrage of a large body of their countrymen, whilst both have to seek re-election—such a senate cannot be in contradiction to the spirit of the times. It may, indeed, have a most ample share of the authority attached to knowledge, experience, and public service. But of that power which rests on tried desert we are not afraid. The reformed House of Lords might sometimes oppose a barrier to the interest of a minority or the passion of a majority. But that strength which the Upper House would derive from becoming representative is a strength drawn from the entire nation, a strength unlikely to be turned against the nation, because created by, and for continuance depending on, its deliberate will.

When a great measure is rejected, every one hears of the event and is interested accordingly. But very, very few know how many measures are withheld for want of time; how many for the same reason are dropped before the end of the session; still worse, how many are passed in haste, in contradiction with themselves and with previous legislation hard to be understood and impossible to be worked; how much time is lost each year in cobbling the faulty productions of the years gone by; how mischievous to everybody, except the lawyers, and irritating to the best among them, is the want of order, perspicuity, and consistency in our statute-book; how little Parliament does of what it should do, how ill that little is done. Yet all this is of daily greater importance to our people. In the period of conflict with other nations now opened we shall need the most unpopular of all virtues—the virtue of thrift; not only the economy of wealth, but the wiser economy of time and power, especially of the time and the power devoted to legislation. Even when the House of Commons shall no longer attempt to do what other bodies can do much better, even when it shall have elaborated a reasonable method of doing its proper business, even then it will find its time, industry, and information severely taxed by what still remains to do. We may get rid of obstruction, but we cannot do without fulness of debate. The more the sphere of government is extended, the more closely must the action of government be scrutinised. Legislation from year to year grows more difficult, touches on a greater diversity of interests, and gives birth to more manifold consequences. In modern legislation, too, all parties must be heard. The House of Commons, therefore, will, as time goes on, debate not less but more. But the House of Lords has not enough business to occupy its powers. If both Houses were brought to their

highest pitch of efficiency, the work of one would not have to be done again in the other. Each House could devote most time to Bills originated in itself. For it is a mistake to suppose that the majority of measures raise a constitutional issue. An economical and social revolution for which no man is responsible has involved an immense mass of purely regulative legislation. It is of prime importance that this legislation should be the ripe result of thought and knowledge. At a time when our trade and manufactures have begun to feel the keenest competition ; when our agriculture seems in danger of succumbing ; when our people, crowded into vast cities, are threatened with novel dangers to health and character ; when our foreign policy involves us in ever-recurring complications ; when the defence and government of India becomes daily more laborious ; when there moves on the face of the earth a spirit of change so penetrating that no man can see how much things have altered, so much has he altered himself ; at a time like this our Legislature needs the unfettered use of all its strength and all its wisdom, to provide for each emergency as it appears ; to modify the ever varying relations of agriculture and commerce ; to strengthen our municipal and provincial institutions ; to raise the efficiency and lower the expense of our administration ; to wage continual war against pauperism, disease, and ignorance ; and to afford to all Europe, to all civilised men, the glorious example of a nation transformed without tumult, retaining all the freshness of youth united with the majesty of age, and now and hereafter, as of old, leading our race in the search after a happier, better, and nobler existence for all.

WILLIAM RATHBONE.

THE LATTER DAY SAINTS AS THEY ARE.

Two articles upon the Mormon question have recently appeared in the *North American Review*. Neither contains a full statement of the case. The first one, presenting the side of the Gentiles, or anti-Mormon, was written by C. C. Goodwin, editor of the leading Gentile paper in Utah. It is very brief. The writer has been a resident of that territory for too short a time to understand fully the condition of affairs. The other article is the production of George Q. Cannon, one of the "Twelve Apostles," and first counsellor to John Taylor, President of the Mormon Church. It gives in favour of polygamy the stale arguments with which the American people have been familiar for the past forty years. As the *North American Review* is extensively read in Great Britain, and as the Mormon missionaries are now active in nearly every portion of the British Empire, I have thought that a full statement of the situation in Utah might be interesting to English readers. Having for many years resided in the vicinity of Salt Lake City, both as a practising lawyer and as a United States or Federal judge, I have had unusual facilities for studying the problem which is daily assuming proportions of great magnitude in the American Republic.

Glorious and decisive was the action of the American nation in the suppression of one of the "twin relics of barbarism." The other is still permitted to overshadow a large section of this free and beautiful land. The result having been accomplished as to the first, many even of its former advocates marvel that it was allowed to exist for so long a period. Very few are to be found who under any circumstances would advocate its restoration. Years hence the American people will be astonished that the other relic was tolerated by the various administrations of the nineteenth century. Of these twins the one that has been destroyed and the one that remains possessed many attributes in common. The most conspicuous of them is an exceedingly aggressive policy. Slavery was not content to remain within its original limits. Polygamy declines to be restricted by the boundaries of the great territory of Utah. At the death of Brigham Young it was believed that the Mormon Church had received a severe blow. Its speedy downfall was predicted. Divided into many factions, each urging the claims of some favourite apostle to occupy the place of the departed prophet, the hierarchy was, indeed, in extreme danger of falling to pieces. But wise counsels prevailed. More was to be feared from the Gentiles than from the Saints. Several apostles were induced to postpone

for a time their ambitious projects. John Taylor was chosen to the vacant presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Oppressed by old age and other infirmities, his election was nearly unanimous. To the conclave that selected him self-preservation and the retention of power formed the most important subjects for consideration. Changes were taking place in Utah. It was found necessary to inaugurate a more guarded policy than that pursued by Brigham Young. The construction of railroads, by which troops could be rapidly massed, and the establishment of a strong military post near Salt Lake City, had during the lifetime of that famous leader rendered possible the publication of a Gentile paper, and the *Salt Lake Tribune*, the successor, we believe, of one or more feebler enterprises, soon attained distinction as one of the most able and fearless journals of the West. For a long time, however, its editors and employés lived as if they were in a state of siege, and when at night they returned to their homes each found it necessary to carry a loaded revolver in his hand ready for immediate use, and to walk in the middle of the street to prevent surprise and assassination. The rich mines of Utah attracted many Gentiles. The railroads brought to the country numerous explorers, tourists, and men of business. The young Mormons learned with admiration that there was a great world east of the Wahsatch Range, and grew restive under the sway of the Saints. Then, shadowed by the lofty mountains of Zion, arose the school-houses and churches of a different faith, and to a certain extent, though very limited indeed, freedom of speech and of the press was a recognised fact. Then many Mormons, doubting after sad experience the divine origin of their Church, and suffering under the exactions of the priesthood, renounced the doctrines of Joseph Smith, refused to pay further tithings, and gloried in the excommunication which of course speedily followed. For the first time since the day of their baptism into that faith they felt that there was a power in the land beyond that of the Mormon Church, which could afford them some protection. Many of these apostates, however, met with a terrible fate.

The late prophet was revered by the mass of the people as the Moses who had led them up out of the land of Egypt. They would suffer more from him than from any other living man. He had ruled the Mormon Church with a rod of iron. Many believed in him so implicitly, and others were so terrified by the acts of his Band of Danites, that even during the latter part of his life, in the time of schools, of railroads, and of newspapers, they feared to oppose his will, and scrupulously obeyed his commands. When he was gone the people could not regard his successor with the same fear and veneration. The leaders in the Church perceived that they had no light task to perform. A new programme must be defined.

Then was encased in a soft kid glove the iron hand which swayed the sceptre of superstition, priestcraft, lust, and blood atonement. Then the Mormons entered upon the rôle of a meek and persecuted people. Instead of the bitter denunciations and profane curses of Brigham Young, a fit type of brute force, we have in a recent number of the *North American Review* the gentle pleadings of George Q. Cannon, the most oily and subtle of their leaders, and the best exponent of their recently adopted policy. He asks that to the people of Utah shall be given "a fair chance." He, foreign born, unnaturalised, an alien living as a polygamist in open defiance of the laws of the United States, asks that to the people whom he represents, and who, according to his own admission, are mostly felons, be given this chance. In other words, he does not intercede for justice. That is not at all what he desires. He does not seek for mercy, for that is only shown to the penitent who promises to amend his ways. The fair chance which he craves is that the Mormon people should be let alone to commit whatever crimes they choose in open defiance of American institutions. The astute Mr. Cannon is certainly not overcome by modesty. But he as chief counsellor of President Taylor finds himself in something of a quandary. With the disturbing elements which have more recently entered into the Church, his course is not one to be easily pursued. If the Church stands still, it is lost. The new policy, however disagreeable, had of necessity to be adopted. The saints hope, nevertheless, in the good time coming to receive ample compensation for the humiliations they must suffer. That good time, in their estimation, will arrive when Utah acquires statehood—when every Federal official shall be driven from the land, and when each office in the new state shall be filled by a polygamous Mormon.

The system of proselytising is now carried on with more skill and energy than ever. Numerous missionaries are sent from every conference to Great Britain, Scandinavia, Australia, and the Southern States. As the converts pour into Utah, new colonies are planted in every adjoining State and Territory. If, like a tree that has been girdled, their institutions were gradually dying out, it might be unadvisable to proceed to extreme measures. Such, however, is not the case. As the advocates of slavery attempted to extend it over the great South-west and West, so the leaders of Mormonism are endeavouring to obtain a foothold in every valley and plain of what is termed the Pacific Slope. How easily slavery could have been disposed of at the time of the Revolution, and how readily can polygamy now be suppressed if our people will give the subject their earnest attention and the cause of right their hearty support.

It is, I admit, quite easy to make charges and to pass censures, but in reference to polygamy and other equally vicious tenets of the

Mormon faith, facts exist which can be completely and readily proved. In passing judgment upon these facts, justice requires us not to forget that the people who are asking for a "fair chance" are not of that class who having repented seek forgiveness for the past, but to those who, still rebellious and persistent in evil, crave immunity for their offences in the future.

Polygamy has arisen to a position of the highest importance in the discussion of Mormon affairs. The reason for this is that our laws punish a man for what he does, and not for what he believes. Its practice is no more reprehensible than are other deeds of these self-termed saints, but it furnishes to the unbeliever a more conspicuous point of attack. Comparisons have frequently been made between the faith of Moslem and that of Mormon. Such comparisons are unjust to the character of Mohammed. When he began to preach in Arabia, that country was sunk in the lowest depths of idolatry. Its people were given to many abominable vices, amongst which was that of sacrificing their children to idols. He raised the Arabians to the worship of the one omnipotent Being, and established a religion which, though it contained many errors, led to the overthrow of the effete Christianity of the East, and spread the purer light of its philosophy over portions of three continents. Its followers founded a magnificent sovereignty in Western Asia, and carried a splendid civilisation to the most remote valleys of Portugal and Spain. Under their sway arts and sciences, poetry and chivalry, flourished side by side. Universities arose which through the Dark Ages preserved the light of knowledge, and which enrolled among their students nobles and princes of the Christian faith. When Mohammed began his career as a prophet he found polygamy, except among the Christians, an established custom throughout all Asia. He merely left it as he found it, after imposing restrictions upon its practice. He saw its evils, but did not think it politic to uproot them.

The founder of Mormonism, on the other hand, began by preaching the gospel of lust and of blood atonement in a country where there is indeed no established religion, but where Christianity, free and untrammelled by the connection of Church and State, exists in its purest form, where the masses of the people are more enlightened than in any other portion of the world, and where freedom and civilisation are effectually united. There, combining the barbarism of the East with the superstition of the Middle Ages, he began to build up his Church. Did he advance one noble sentiment or one original suggestion that might increase the happiness of his fellow-beings, or induce them to lead purer and better lives? His teachings, and the result of those teachings, sufficiently answer the question.

Among the religions regarded as false by the majority of Americans

to-day, we find good and evil strangely blended. To Confucius, notwithstanding the fallacy of many of his doctrines, is attributed the first enunciation of the golden rule. Zoroaster taught a pure and sublime theology to his disciples, the Fire Worshipers of Persia. Gautama, or Buddha, inculcated exalted sentiments of benevolence and moral duty, and condemned the doctrine of caste, which has proved so injurious to the welfare of the Hindoos. Greece, with her polytheism, has given to the world Homer and Aristotle, Socrates and Plato. Catholic Europe, though yet showing the scars of the Spanish Inquisition, glories in the names of Dante and of Michel Angelo, of Pascal and of Fénelon. But what has Mormonism, with her fifty years of existence and hundreds of thousands of converts, to offer as blessings to the world? With confidence I challenge its priesthood to point to one generous sentiment, to one exalted idea, of which it can justly claim the origin, or to produce one man who has been of any especial benefit, morally or intellectually, to his fellows. But I am asking for an impossibility. As well might we seek for mountain glens and fertile valleys in the desert of Sahara as to expect the Mormons to reply to such a challenge. To them a well-filled harem and a herd of fat cattle are the highest objects of aspiration.

Laws are enacted by the Mormons rather for the encouragement of licentiousness than for the prevention of vice. We find no acts in their statute-books to prohibit seduction or to punish bastardy. Some time since, when I first attended the district court at Ogden, Utah, it was presided over, as in similar tribunals, by a Federal judge, but proceeded under the laws of the Territory. An elder of the church was indicted and arraigned for criminality with his own daughter. He pleaded guilty, and received a sentence of twenty years. Familiar with the general form of indictments, I thought it remarkable that the one in this case charged the crime of rape instead of that of incest. Judge of my astonishment when I was informed by the United States attorney that no statute against that offence was in force there, and that as far as the laws affected the matter, a man might cohabit with his daughter, sister, or other near female relative without fear of punishment. The statute-books of the Territory speak for themselves. In the instance just referred to no conviction could have been had but for the fact that the elder's daughter was under twelve years of age.

The priesthood are efficiently organized. The highest dignitary is the President of the Church. Next in rank are his two counsellors; then follow the "Twelve Apostles," and the presidents of the various "Stakes in Zion." Each of the latter has also two counsellors. Afterwards, in order, are the bishops and their counsellors, the high priests, the elders, and the Members of the Seventies. All may preach and baptize; but the higher dignitaries possess numerous other powers.

All but the President and Apostles can be ordered on foreign missions. With few exceptions the priests practise polygamy to the full extent of their means. They wear no garb to distinguish themselves from the other members of the Church. They are nearly all engaged in trade or in agricultural pursuits. Their position affords rare facilities for the accumulation of wealth. The tithing passes through their hands. They succeed admirably in business. They are generally the directors of the different Zion's Co-operative Mercantile Institutes, and most of the local officers, as members of the legislature and judges of probate, are selected from their order. Aware by secret methods, of all things of importance that are taking place throughout Utah and other regions where members of their Church are located, they also keep well informed as to the private history and domestic relations of all such members. They are permitted to interfere with the business relations and most private affairs, not only of all laymen, but of every priest of inferior rank to themselves. They never fail to enforce their privileges, when by so doing they can gratify their disposition to meddle, add to their store of wealth, or satiate their desire for revenge.

They urge the practice of polygamy on all their followers, and especially upon young men of talents, influence, and independence of character. This they do not only to justify their own conduct, but to forge the chains more strongly around others. For if a man has children by polygamous wives, he must either declare them illegitimate or else remain in the Mormon Church, and obsequiously obey the dictates of his spiritual leaders. If such an one should apostatize, the Church would no longer protect him in his infraction of the laws, and a Mormon jury would require but little evidence to induce it to find an apostate guilty of bigamy. Hence the rule is, "Once a polygamist, always a polygamist." I know from their own admissions, of many Mormons who would apostatize but for the difficulties mentioned. This doctrine of plural marriages, as they term it, is preached very mildly in foreign lands. The convert drinks at first of the new milk of their gospel. Far different doctrines are inculcated when once they have him secure in Utah.

Upon coming face to face with Mormonism as it really exists, many are surprised and shocked. Some renounce the faith at once. Others, with less courage, submit, but so ungraciously as to attract the evil eye of the priesthood. Nevertheless most of the converts learn to swallow every doctrine however rank, and to appreciate the flavour of such as are most highly seasoned. When the missionaries abroad, in Sweden for instance, have collected a number of converts, they take them to the seaboard where a ship provided by the Church is awaiting them. If possessed of money, they are persuaded to give it to the missionaries for safe keeping. The latter promise to return

it as soon as they reach Zion. But happy is the poor emigrant if he ever sees any portion of it again. He is charged enormously for everything furnished by the Church. Unable to procure supplies elsewhere, he must submit. When he reaches Utah and calls for his money, he is put off first upon one pretext and then upon another. Clothing, seed-corn, and old ploughs are delivered to him at high rates. At last, that he may receive any benefit at all from his funds, he accepts at an exorbitant price a few acres of church land. Unless gifted, however, with a full share of shrewdness, he will never see the clothing, the land, nor the seed-corn. If, on the other hand, the emigrant is poor, his passage money and railroad fare are paid with a great show of benevolence by the Church, but he enters Utah to find himself borne down with debt, ruled by numerous masters, the veriest serf on the face of the earth.

When trains loaded with emigrants reach Salt Lake City, the apostles and other dignitaries of the Mormon Church, men sleek and opulent, gather to receive them and to select for their own harems fairer and more youthful inmates. Until this object is accomplished, other brethren must remain in the background and gaze in silence. Some time since one of the Twelve cast his odious glances upon a girl from Denmark. He was nearly sixty, she not over eighteen. The desires of the great apostle were intimated to her by a Danish bishop. She acknowledged that the union with so high a dignitary of the Church would confer great honour upon her, but confessed that a young countryman of hers had won her affections during the voyage, and that she had promised to marry him upon the following day. She supposed that that statement would settle the matter. She was told, however, that she must not resist the wishes of one of the anointed in Israel. She remained firm. The expectant bridegroom was next interviewed by the bishop, but with no better success. Great surprise was expressed by the priesthood at such contumacy. The will of one of the Twelve was not to be gainsaid. That night the maiden was forced into his harem. The next morning her lover, the victim of the Danites, was found alive but mutilated in a glen of the Wahsatch Mountains.

Many inquiries are made about Mormon harems and the homes of polygamists. They differ materially according to the rank and wealth of the proprietor. Brigham Young kept the oldest of his wives at the Zion House, and erected a neat villa for each younger and particular favourite. One of the apostles, in a different city, kept nine wives in one large house; but each wife has separate apartments opening upon the lawn which surrounds the house. The entire building is enclosed by a high wall to keep out the gaze of the wicked world. In another city, the first counsellor for that state has three pretty cottages side by side and a wife in each cottage.

Many of the poorer saints, desirous of "living up to their privileges" as inculcated by the priesthood, have several wives in one hovel, and that hovel with but one room. That room serves, of course, as kitchen and bedroom, dining-room and parlour. But even Mormons prefer harmony in their own household, and as rapidly as their means will permit they provide a separate house, or at least a distinct apartment, for each wife. When this has been accomplished by a prosperous Saint, he lives with each one for a week at a time until he has made the circuit, when he commences anew. Nothing is known in polygamous families of the inestimable blessings of home. I mean home in strictly the American sense. Each child looks to its mother alone for advice and sympathy. Many men do not know their own children, and it requires a very wise son to know his own father. Recently a bishop was passing along the streets of one of the cities of Utah, when he found several boys quarrelling and disturbing the peace. "It is a shame," he exclaimed in righteous indignation, "that children should be left to grow up in this manner. Who is your father?" "We belong to Bishop S——" was the reply, "so you had better let us alone." And then it dawned upon him that they were his own children.

The offspring of the first wife regard the children of the others as illegitimate. They look upon the later wives as women who have robbed the first one of her husband's affections, and as no better than prostitutes. The second wife by a plural marriage revenges herself by flaunting in the face of the lawful wife the fact that the younger enjoys a much higher degree of the husband's favour. Neither does harmony prevail among the later accessions themselves to the harem. The youngest, and generally the favourite of their common lord, is looked upon by all the others with malicious envy. When they live in separate houses, the head of the family can generally maintain discipline; but when they meet frequently, abusive language, hair-pulling, and the use of rods and fists are the result, and the old wife who has outlived her usefulness is coolly given up by the husband to the malice and cruelty of the others. Mr. Cannon claims that the Mormons are building up the kingdom of God on earth, but does not explain the way in which it is being done. Residents of Utah can learn for themselves. Casual visitors, on the other hand, especially men of distinction, are received by the Mormon leaders with great consideration. They are fêted and flattered. The iniquities of the Mormon system are concealed effectually from their view. Many of them return to the East believing that they know all about Utah, and that the Mormons are not such bad fellows after all.

Mr. Cannon speaks of chastity. It is conceded that the Mormons promptly resent all interference with their domestic relations by a

Gentile. In their opinion, death cannot sufficiently punish one who attempts even to marry a girl destined for the harem of a Saint. I further admit that there are a number for the first wives of the Mormons who are as pure and devoted as any woman in America. But human nature and animal passions exist in Utah as in New York ; and where every law of the land tends to shield licentiousness and to degrade female virtues, how can the sanctity of the marriage tie or the purity of the gentler sex be maintained at the exalted standard which prevails in other portions of our country ? I have already referred to the absence in Utah of laws for the prevention of different crimes. I further find that, until very recently, the statute-books contained acts relative to divorce that were sufficient to disgrace any civilised people. One of its provisions permitted a non-resident of the Territory to procure a divorce within a very few days after commencement of the suit, provided that the plaintiff swore that it was his or her intention to become at some future day a resident of Utah. Thus in many cases divorces were granted to parties neither of whom had ever been for a moment within the boundaries of that Territory. This statute continued in force until it was so universally condemned and denounced by courts throughout the United States, as to convince the hierarchy that it was well to have it repealed. But even as the law now stands, a person who is a resident of Utah can obtain a divorce on the slightest pretext, and the courts are compelled to grant numerous decrees. The priesthood are also authorised by the rules of the Church to annul marriages, and as most of those contracted there are void under the laws of the United States, a divorce by the priests answers the purpose as well, and saves time if not expense.

Seduction is common in Utah. As the result becomes manifest, the girl is saved from open shame by being made the third or fourth wife of her seducer. He may soon tire of her, and procure a divorce. She will enter another harem as the wife of another polygamist. By these methods of procedure one woman may, at the age of forty, have had several so-called husbands, all of whom are at that time alive. But the worst feature of the custom is that a woman hitherto strictly virtuous is frequently divorced, and compelled by the usages of the country and by the necessities of life to follow the same course. How can virtue and refined sensibilities be promoted by such usages ?

When the Mormon leaders are opposed directly by facts which they cannot deny, they say, "There may be some objections to our system ; but we are not troubled with the great social evil as you are in the States. Our methods promote virtue, and are vastly superior to yours." But does the fact that vice is secretly indulged in here furnish any reason why in a different form it should be tolerated in

Utah. Pleading the crimes of another has always been held but a poor defence for one's own transgressions. But even this weak apology of the Saints is, unfortunately for them, not sustained by facts. It is well known in Utah that no ties of marriage or of friendship restrained Brigham Young, even with his immense harem, no matter who might be the object, in the gratification of his desires. Indeed, the wives as well as the sisters and daughters of the faithful believed that they were honoured by the embraces of their prophet. It is notorious in Salt Lake City that the infamous houses there are largely supported by polygamists.

The bishops, while they possess the power, encourage but never restrain the practice of polygamy. They intermeddle in such affairs, however, as in all others affecting the business and the domestic relations of every Mormon. They dictate as to the education of children, the trades to be learned by the boys, the fashions to be adopted by the girls, the manner in which the older members shall conduct their business, and even as to the locality in which they must reside. If any one resists this interference, he will be sent on a foreign mission, be openly censured at the tabernacle, or cut off from the Church and handed over to the buffetings of Satan. I know of an instance where a prominent polygamist was excommunicated because he would not follow the advice of certain Mormon lawyers, given in their interests, but directly adverse to his own. When cut off from the Church one is termed an apostate; and the Saints, unwilling to wait until the archfiend can receive what has been assigned to him by an authority so high, commence a series of persecutions remarkable for their ingenuity and malice. Their victim is subjected to loss of property, insults, assaults, and not unfrequently to a violent death.

Mr. Cannon asserts, somewhat adroitly, that the juries of Utah have been prompt in punishing bigamy. He means bigamy among Gentiles and apostates, not polygamy among his own people. I do not recall any instance of the kind, but have no doubt that they would gladly punish any who, outside of the pale of their Church, attempted "to live up to the privileges" which they alone are entitled to enjoy. It would present to them a rare occasion for exhibiting their abhorrence of such criminal acts.

Two Mormons have been convicted in Utah for bigamy, as defined by the statutes of the United States. As that people did not think proper to pass any act prohibiting the offence, Congress found it necessary to interpose its high authority, and enacted a law for the benefit of the Territories, and of Utah in particular. It has, however, availed but little; while the laws for selecting juries remain as they are at present, very few convictions can be obtained for polygamy. The attorneys for the United States, whatever their energy

and ability, labour mostly in vain. As well might the Grand Sanhedrim at Jerusalem have been urged to punish Annas and Caiaphas for their course preceding the crucifixion, as could a Mormon jury be requested to render a verdict of guilty against a brother polygamist. Of the two cases mentioned where convictions have been won, the first was that of Reynolds. He was, with the tacit consent of the Church, found guilty in order that a test case might be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. The other was that of Miles, who, to evince his especial contempt for the laws of the country to which he had very recently sworn allegiance, married, according to the Mormon form, three women in one day. He was tried before a jury which, by mere chance, contained a large proportion of Gentiles and disaffected Mormons. Both cases were appealed, first to the Supreme Court of Utah, where the judgments of the District Courts were affirmed. They were then taken by the defendants to the Supreme Court of the United States. That court, in the case of Reynolds, held that the law enacted by Congress to prohibit bigamy in the Territories was not unconstitutional, and directed that the judgment should be affirmed and enforced. Consequently Reynolds is now serving out his term in the Penitentiary. When this decision was announced it was amusing to see what profound jurists the Territory of Utah contained. Unsparring criticism, censure, and abuse were bestowed upon the highest court in the land. It was composed exclusively, according to Mormon authority, of bigoted, corrupt, or timid judges, who utterly ignored constitutional law. The Mormon press contended that as the doctrine of polygamy formed one of the tenets of their holy religion, the Constitution of the United States guaranteed them the right to practise it. I was at that time frequently asked by what authority Congress could interfere with the practice of any religious rites. I replied that the Constitution protected one in his belief, but not in criminal acts the result of that belief, and suggested that if the descendants of the Aztecs, some of whom may now be found not far from the southern boundaries of Utah, should persist in practising the former rites of their religion by offering human sacrifices to the sun, no civilised and Christian people could object to the trial and execution of the Aztec priests for murder; that it would rather be their duty to see the law rigidly enforced, and that no one would attempt to question the constitutionality of the law under which such proceedings could be conducted. The same might be said in reference to Brahmins, who, coming to this country, should attempt upon the death of one of their number to practise the rites of Suttee. Polygamy as well as murder being a felony, these were parallel cases.

In the matter of Miles which has been referred to, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the judgment of the lower

court, and ordered a new trial on the ground that improper evidence had been admitted upon the trial of the cause. This case presents another question for the consideration of Congress. The rules of evidence should be somewhat modified by that body. After a man has been indicted for the marriage of more wives than the statute permits, the prosecuting attorney finds it very difficult to convict him even before an impartial jury, for the reason that no records are kept of plural marriages; the priests who perform them refuse point-blank to testify, or adroitly evade the questions; the defendant declines to answer on the ground that he may criminate himself; and the evidence of the wives cannot be admitted as long as they testify that they are his wives and there is no proof to the contrary. Though the courts do not recognise all of them, the difficulty is to ascertain which is the lawful wife.

Cordially agreeing with most of the statements contained in Judge Goodwin's article, which appeared in the March number of the *North American Review*, I know that he errs as to the position of the Hebrew race in Utah, whom he mentions as belonging to an old nation of polygamists. I am convinced from personal observation that there are in that Territory no citizens who comply more strictly with the letter and spirit of the national laws, who more consistently and unflinchingly oppose the doctrines of the Mormon faith, than the descendants of Israel. On one occasion, long prior to the appearance of Judge Goodwin's article, when asked what we thought of that Territory, we replied that it was a strange country, "where a native American is a foreigner and a Jew is a Gentile."

Among the many evils besides polygamy which result from the teaching of the Mormon leaders, are ignorance, superstition, priestly tyranny, financial exactions, and blood atonement. The first leads to the second, and the second opens the way to the third. Brigham Young was opposed to the education of the masses, well aware that it would interfere with his terrible power. As times have changed, however, the priesthood deem it politic to establish a few schools. These are conducted in such a manner that no conscientious Gentile can permit his children to attend them. Mormon works only are used as text books. The doctrine of plural marriages is inculcated in them while the children are very young, and hatred to the government of the United States is carefully instilled at the same time. Were any one disposed to question my statements in this particular, the recent diabolical rejoicings of the Mormon people over the atrocious and detestable attempt of Guiteau upon the life of President Garfield would furnish sufficient evidence of the hostile sentiment of the masses of Utah to all things purely free and strictly American.

Some curiosity exists as to the politics of the Saints. During the

last election every Mormon paper, and ninety-nine hundredths of the Mormon people, favoured the election of General Hancock; but in making this statement there is no intention to reflect upon that splendid soldier or upon the great party that supported him. The Mormons, like the Irishman of the story, are against the government; and as the Republican party has had control of that for the past twenty years, they are naturally opposed to that party also.

To one who has resided for a length of time in Utah or its vicinity, many of the statements of Mr. Cannon are to say the least amusing. He denies that the priesthood interferes with politics in the other Territories. The fact is that in Idaho the Church holds the balance of power, and consequently at every election a delegate to Congress is returned who has been duly approved by the conclave at Salt Lake City. In 1874 there was a spirited contest in Wyoming at the biennial election for delegate. The Mormons, who cast several hundred votes in the western part of the Territory, favoured on personal grounds the candidate of the Republicans and pledged themselves to vote for him *en masse*, but prior to the election orders came from the hierarchy at Salt Lake City that the vote of the Church must be given to the nominee of the Democratic party. It was done; it elected him; and the Mormons did not hesitate to explain why they had voted contrary to the promises which they had given.

In the same Territory some two years since the Republican candidate was less objectionable to the priesthood than the Democratic one. Bishop Musser was sent into Wyoming to see that the faithful obeyed the mandates sent out from Zion. By his adroit management of political affairs he so effectually belied his name that the latter candidate met with an overwhelming defeat. Yet Mr. Cannon affirms that his Church does not interfere with elections and political affairs in the other Territories. Mr. Cannon further states that the Mormons are liberal in their views regarding the Gentiles, that they do not exclude them from office, and that the latter can carry on business in Utah under as favourable auspices as the Saints themselves. I do not believe that Mr. Cannon can point to an instance where his people have chosen for office a single man among the well-qualified Gentiles of Utah. We can point to a case, and the only one of the kind, in which the Mormons have had an opportunity of taking action and of showing a generous spirit. In a county where the Churchmen were in a minority an estimable Gentile was duly elected to the legislature of Utah. He was, however, excluded from a seat in that body for the sole reason that he was not in communion with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Business affairs in Utah are conducted on the same exclusive system. In many instances Mormons are prohibited from purchasing

goods from outsiders. The Zion's Co-operative Mercantile Institutes of each county monopolize all kinds of trade. The Saints are forbidden except in extreme cases to retain any but Mormon lawyers. This rule keeps all matters within the Church, and enables the shrewd and opulent to make large exactions from the ignorant and poor. Instead of concurring with the statements of Mr. Cannon, we feel that we are fully justified in saying that to-day ninety-nine out of every hundred of the Gentiles of Utah are convinced that they could not continue to reside in that Territory with either comfort or safety if Federal protection were withdrawn and a state government inaugurated.

Mr. Cannon barely refers to the question of blood atonement, and attempts to explain it as a very simple matter; but all the old residents of Utah are aware that the term possesses a very different signification from the one given by this astute defender of the abominations of the East. The doctrine of blood atonement was one by which Brigham Young assumed the authority, without trial, to put to death any refractory member of the Mormon Church. He taught that by such expiation the transgressors would finally attain to a happy immortality. But we can scarcely suppose from the very free manner in which he exercised this power, that he was influenced more by the interest he felt in the future welfare of his followers, than by a base desire to gratify his own feelings of hatred and revenge. Mr. Cannon passes completely by the atrocities of the Morrisite carnage (of which the Mormons themselves do not deny that they were the sole cause), and partially admits that some emigrants were killed by a party composed of both whites and Indians in the massacre of Mountain Meadows, but insists that Brigham Young was not implicated in that affair. The Pope of Rome may not have instigated the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Brigham Young may not have directly commanded the massacre at Mountain Meadows. But the former ordered Te Deums to be chanted in the capital of the pontiffs when he heard of the slaughter of the Huguenots, and the latter did not hesitate to appoint the chief actors in the tragedy at Mountain Meadows to high positions in Church and State, and did not blush to receive from their blood-stained hands the plunder obtained from their victims. The Catholic Church has been held accountable for one massacre, and the Mormon Church will be for the other.

John D. Lee was tried and executed for the crime. But no Mormon jury would have dared to render a verdict of guilty in such a case without the sanction of the head of the Church. The prosecution was anxious to procure at all hazards the conviction of so prominent a criminal. The hierarchy, alarmed by the intractable disposition of Lee, fearful that he would betray the secrets of the Church, wearied with his importunate appeals for protection, and

desirous of showing to the world that it was ready to deliver into the hands of justice so famous a member of their body, entered apparently into some agreement with the prosecution for the United States in accordance with which their holy religion was to be exempt from attack and contumely, and John D. Lee was to be delivered as a scapegoat to the executioner. This is the only reasonable explanation that can be given of the mysterious proceedings which took place in Southern Utah at the time of the trial and execution of Lee, whose atrocious crimes were the natural outgrowth of his superstition.

Mr. Cannon does not appear to be any happier in his other attempts at explanation. His article is evidently written for eastern and not for western readers. The latter are too well informed upon the subject to suit his purposes. He endeavours to prove that Mormonism is purely of American growth and is not hostile to American institutions. In support of this proposition he tells us how many apostles and bishops are natives of this country. It is not the question where a man was born, but what he thinks and does, by which we are to know whether he is a loyal and law-abiding citizen of this country. John Taylor, the President of the Mormon Church, is an Englishman; his first counsellor, Mr. Cannon, late delegate to Congress, and the most influential man in the Church, is a native of the same country. I concede, however, that the American Mormons have by their shrewdness and thrift procured for themselves most of the high places in the hierarchy and the lion's share of the revenues of the Church. The mass of the people, however, the ignorant dupes and victims, are mostly natives of Great Britain, Scandinavia, and Germany. The American leaders in the Church are rather to be regarded as renegades who have renounced their first faith and nationality, and sworn allegiance to a foreign power. No man was more bitterly hostile to the institutions of this great Republic than Brigham Young; upon every occasion he uttered denunciations and curses against its people, its principles, and its laws; and he was born in the ever loyal state of Vermont.

Little better does Mr. Cannon succeed when he attempts to make his readers believe that the Mormon is a Christian Church. Even after a long residence in Utah it is very difficult for any one to tell what its real tenets are. The masses believe portions of the Bible, all of the Book of Mormon, everything that they hear read from the Church organ, the *Deseret News*, the sermons of the priesthood, and each doctrine, however absurd, which their spiritual leaders may tell them is necessary to salvation. Many of the dignitaries of the Church are openly charged with pantheism and atheism. Some lean far towards the teachings of Buddha. Others maintain that the spirit of every man will become a separate and distinct deity, while

many regard the Creator as a being within the limits of their comprehension, and who, like man, exists in a material form. One of their most intelligent elders, who had probably never heard, however, of Gautama or the Nirvana, told me that he did not believe that after death his soul would enjoy a separate existence, but that it would at once return to the Godhead and become merged with it. During last autumn Mr. Cannon himself made some statements at the dedication of a schoolhouse, or more properly a Mormon temple, in Ogden City, which were decidedly startling. The Church papers touched upon the subject very delicately. A gentleman connected with one of the leading papers in Omaha, a paper noted for its friendliness to the Mormons, was present. Meeting me soon after he said, "I am what you would call a freethinker, but am really a Buddhist. Judge W—— asked me to go around and hear Mr. Cannon. I did so. I was exceedingly pleased with his remarks. I should call him a pronounced Buddhist. I told Judge W—— that I had never heard any doctrine that suited me better, and if that was the belief of the Mormons I would be ready, but for polygamy, to join them at once." A man in this country has the privilege of believing what he likes. That is conceded as a matter of course. We have therefore merely stated the above to show what credit should be given to Mr. Cannon's assertions, that his is a Christian Church.

At the late election in Utah, Allen G. Campbell was the candidate of the Liberal or Gentile party, and George Q. Cannon that of the "People's" or Mormon party, for delegate to Congress. The question of Republicanism or Democracy did not enter into the contest. The Mormon officers returned a majority in favour of Mr. Cannon. Mr. Campbell contested the case on the grounds—first, that Mr. Cannon was foreign born, and had never been naturalized; second, that as a polygamist he was yet further disqualified from sitting in the National Councils. After a full hearing of the matter, Governor Murray awarded a certificate of election to Mr. Campbell. Those anxious to procure choice expressions of vilification will find them in the Church papers of that period. Mr. Cannon then gave notice that he would contest the seat in the House of Representatives. Mr. Adams, the clerk of that body, has since assumed the duties of the house, has refused to recognise the certificate given to Mr. Campbell, and pays Mr. Cannon just as if he had been regularly certified by the Governor of Utah. Mr. Adams evidently proceeds upon the hypothesis that two wrongs make a right, for adopting his own theory of the case he has completely stultified himself. If Governor Murray erred in going behind the returns of the Utah official, the course of Mr. Adams has certainly been equally erroneous in going behind the Governor's certificate. He had no more authority to review and set aside the action of the chief magistrate of Utah

than that officer had to ignore the returns of the officers of election for the Territory. But the Mormons have always possessed a mysterious influence in Washington. When the House of Representatives next assembles, the merits of the case will, we hope, be finally decided. The law-abiding people, the true Americans of that Territory, the Gentiles, as they are termed by their opponents, are, with good reason, desirous of being represented in Congress by one of their own number, and not by a polygamous alien, who cares no more for the true interests of Utah than Pontius Pilate did for those of Palestine. Good laws are even to a greater extent than usual necessary to the welfare of the Territory. The Gentiles do not, as Mr. Cannon does, wish to evade and disobey such laws. Neither do they desire any special legislation in their behalf. They merely ask that Utah shall be as free a country as Montana, and that the laws of the United States shall have the same force there as they do in all other States and Territories ; and that if the statutes, as they now are, do not clothe the executive with sufficient authority to carry out the general laws, such statutes should be so amended as to provide in an ample manner the means for enforcing them.

The Constitution of the United States in effect prohibits the enactment of laws which make a distinction in the rights of persons. The laws of this country provide that every voter shall be at least twenty-one years of age and a citizen of the United States either by birth or naturalisation. To become naturalised it is necessary to prove a continuous residence in this country for five years, and that the first papers were issued two years prior to the application for the second and final ones. But the legislature of Utah has enacted that all women and girls, of whatever age or nationality, shall be regarded as of full age as soon as they are married, and that a female of foreign birth shall be considered as a citizen of the United States and of Utah, without taking any other steps whatever to become naturalised, upon her marriage with a citizen of this country. The literal effect of this law is, that any girl, though she is but twelve years of age, may arrive in Utah directly from Europe in the morning of an election, become the twelfth wife of a Mormon, deposit her ballot during the day, and afterwards enjoy all the privileges of a citizen of this country. Such circumstances are of the most frequent occurrence in that Territory. Of course the benefits derived from the law inure to the polygamous lord ; but that fact does not render the situation any less galling to the Gentiles. An effort has been made to have this law pronounced, as it undoubtedly is, unconstitutional by the Federal courts of the Territory ; but the judges are frequently changed, and some of them do not appear anxious to grapple with this question of what is and what is not constitutional. No decision in the matter has yet been arrived at.

The responsibility for the condition of affairs in Utah rests, to some extent, on prior administrations; still more upon former members of Congress; but chiefly upon the people themselves of the United States. They have too closely imitated the church of Laodicea. When they once resolve that the laws of their country shall be supreme in Utah, and that an American citizen shall enjoy the same freedom there that he enjoys in Dacotah, Congress will promptly enact the requisite statutes, and the executive will as readily enforce them. Many excellent bills have been heretofore introduced into Congress for terminating the difficulties in Utah; but by some mysterious means they have been completely suppressed, or else so garbled as to deprive them of most of their value.

Until very recently every elector was compelled, if he voted at all, to cast an open ballot, or what amounted to the same thing. His ballot was numbered, and the number set opposite his name in the poll-books. Thus the priesthood knew precisely how every Mormon voted, and, unless prepared openly to apostatize, each one had of necessity to vote for the Church candidate. A bill, providing that elections in that Territory should be conducted in the same manner as elsewhere, was brought before Congress, but was dropped upon the representation that the legislature of Utah was about to pass a similar bill. The Mormons had, when they learned that Congress proposed to act in the matter, prepared a new law to suit themselves. It was a trifle better than the old one, yet it still left the control of elections completely in the hands of the Church. The Mormons passed it, hoping thereby to prevent Congress from enacting a just law upon the subject, and in this they have thus far succeeded.

As Mr. Cannon says, "Give Utah a fair chance." Give her a free ballot, upright and impartial juries, and a law under which a polygamist, as well as any other criminal, can be convicted upon circumstantial evidence, and the last of the Twin Relics of Barbarism will speedily meet its doom. The matter rests with the American people; it is they who are responsible for the present condition of affairs.

EDWARD A. THOMAS.

RAILWAYS AND WATERWAYS.

THE war of rates between the trunk lines converging upon Chicago has naturally attracted a good deal of attention lately. The rates for past seasons have ruled at about 30 cents in summer and 35 in winter per 100 lbs. of grain, from Chicago to New York; but lately it was stated that rates had been reduced to 20 cents, to 15 cents, and even so low as $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents. What this means will be understood when it is remembered that so careful an authority as Commissioner Fink stated before the New York Railroad Investigating Committee, and repeated in the *New York World* so late as the 17th March last, that 20 cents per 100 lbs. was the lowest possible figure he could name as the actual cost of carrying grain between Chicago and New York, exclusive of interest on capital or contingent expenses. Before the safer plan of "pooling" traffic was adopted, the Americans used to say that "the bankrupt road ruled the rates." It may be that the latest member of the Chicago "pool" is aggressive, although we cannot readily conceive the management of the Grand Trunk ambitious of the application of the American saying, any more than we care to contemplate it in open conflict with the combined strength of the companies radiating from Chicago to New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

The true significance of the lowering of rates has, in great measure, been lost sight of, from its being too generally assumed that the rate-cutting had arisen wholly from the inherent combativeness and love of overreaching one another, which are regarded—and not without considerable reason—as the ruling passions of railway managers. That these elements aggravate the situation it need not be denied; but the real reason for a reduction of rates has been that the railway companies have been impelled to this course, or to leave the transport of grain altogether to their water competitors.

Events for some time have been foreshadowing a reduction of rates. Not long ago the natural rivalry between the eastern seaports¹ was stimulated into renewed activity when Massachusetts finished the Hoosac Tunnel; New York seeing a possibility of Boston taking away, a large part of her commerce. But New York foresees her

(1) A tangible evidence of this reaches me at the time of writing. It is announced that, at a meeting of capitalists and merchants held at Baltimore on the 4th August, the immediate construction of a canal across Maryland and Delaware, to connect Baltimore with the ocean, was decided upon. Six out of the eight million dollars this work is estimated to cost, it is also stated, are already subscribed. This new route will shorten the distance between the western grain fields and the English ports by 200 miles.

commercial pre-eminence directly threatened from another quarter—the Canadian system of canals. “Canada has commenced,” reports the State Engineer of New York, “and will in a few years complete, the finest system of inland navigation in the world, and which will make seaports of our great lake cities. . . . British steamships of nearly 2,000 tons will lie at the docks of Chicago and other lake ports, unloading their merchandise or receiving their cargoes of grain, provisions, &c.” The British, he points out, will not have to tranship or elevate their grain; they can continue their voyage through lake Ontario, the St. Lawrence, and the ocean to Europe, only having to pay toll on the Welland Canal and on the river above Montreal. In view of the anticipated competition on the completion of the Canadian canals, the United States Government is engaged in deepening Buffalo Harbour, improving the channels between the lakes and the tide-waters of the Hudson River; while the State Engineer of New York is strenuously urging that a foot of water be added to the Erie Canal by raising the banks, that the transport of freight may be cheapened by being carried in larger cargoes. Again, during the past two years the tolls on west-bound traffic on the canals have been remitted on some articles and reduced on others, the State looking for compensation in the augmented east-bound business that would be attracted by the lower charges. The prudence of this policy has been proved, inasmuch as last year the quantity of grain shipped by canal from Buffalo was 72,000,000 bushels, an excess of 18,000,000 bushels over the previous year, and 13,500,000 more than in 1878; while the total amount received for canal tolls for the last year was 1,164,567 dollars, being 238,823 dollars more than the preceding year. The canals, even in their present condition, are capable of carrying still more—up to 100,000,000 bushels yearly, with a proportionate increase in the amount of coarse freight. According to Mr. Fink, the railroads carried into New York 54,000,000 bushels of grain last year during the navigable season. An effort is being made to reduce the quantity by rail, for, carrying the policy begun two years ago to its utmost limit, the State Canal Board, with the approval of the Legislature, has this year abolished altogether the tolls on west-bound traffic. This movement is intended as a set-off to the advantages of the enlarged Canadian canals; but, at the same time, how much it presses upon the railroad companies to reduce their rates for transport, or lose the grain-carrying business, is apparent. The average rate of freight last year by canal from Buffalo to New York, a distance of 500 miles, was $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel of wheat, including the toll of 1 cent a bushel. The rate is probably less this year.

As already mentioned, the railroad companies have been in the habit of charging 5 cents additional per 100 lbs. during the winter

months, alleging as their reason the higher cost of working, but obviously simply using their opportunity while the lakes and canals were frozen. It is doubtful whether even this advantage will not soon be, if it is not already, wrested from them. At all events the improvements in the Mississippi, and as an ever-open and rival grain route, cannot be sneered at any longer. They are a factor that cannot but seriously influence the rail rates. The continued supremacy of Chicago itself as the great entrepôt of the east and the west is not quite assured. The centre of population and production is steadily moving towards a point between Chicago and St. Louis. And with the rapid extension of the Southern Pacific lines, coinciding with the improvements in the Mississippi River, this movement will be accelerated. The arrival of a shipment of 74,000 bushels of corn from New Orleans at New York, in March last, gave occasion to the editor of a St. Louis paper to indulge his self-gratulation by saying, "We may send some of that California wheat to New York via New Orleans, just to prove the unapproachable cheapness of rapid transit and the reality of the jetty improvements at the mouth. The country seems to be just awakening to the fact that St. Louis is practically a seaport, the Mississippi being a great arm of the sea stretching up to our wharf." The *Chicago Tribune* at the same time saying, "It may be accepted as a fixed fact that the Mississippi is now, and will be henceforth, a rival route for grain and other western products, especially in the winter and spring months. This competition will be immediately felt by the railways leading east, and by all the cities not located on the Mississippi River." The *St. Louis Miller*, in a recent article devoted to this subject, says, "Some weeks since the attention of the commercial world was called to an immense shipment of grain, by barges in one tow, to New Orleans for export. The amount withdrawn from the St. Louis elevators at that time was 10,000 tons. The surprised gratification that followed this successful shipment of grain on through bills of lading, at rates infinitely less than those exacted by the railroads, will be much intensified now that even the performance noted has been eclipsed. . . . On the night of May 14th a tow left this city, in charge of the *Oakland*, comprising 150,000 bushels of wheat, 200,000 bushels of corn, 5,000 barrels of flower, and a miscellaneous collection of package freight that alone will equal 500 tons. In tonnage the freight is represented by over 11,000 tons. To move this by rail would require sixty-seven trains of sixteen cars each. By water the grain will reach New Orleans in six days, whereas the railroads centering here could not transport it in less than two months' time at the rate of one train a day. On Monday two other tows followed with 250,000 bushels each; and the Mississippi Valley Line is also preparing a monster tow." The St. Louis and New Orleans Trans-

portation Company also has already forty-three barges, and more are in process of construction—all on a new and successful ventilating system. They have a carrying capacity of 1,700 tons each, and one steamer is capable of taking six of these immense barges in one tow.

Further emphasis is given to this diversion of trade, and renewed competition in transport of freight, in the report which reached us at the end of June that a State Convention of Iowa had passed a resolution calling upon Congress to make a grant of 5,000,000 dollars for the improvement of the Missouri River. This is a fitting sequel to the jettying of the shoal places in the Mississippi, and, when accomplished, the produce of the Missouri Valley, said to amount to 500,000,000 bushels annually, can be diverted from Chicago, whence it is now carried by rail, towards St. Louis and New Orleans.

It is in the operation of all these causes, actual and potential, that the real reason for the reduction of rail rates to the eastern seaboard is to be found. The effect upon railroads as property it is not our purpose to speculate upon. Our object is rather to draw serious attention to the steps which the Americans have taken to ensure cheap transport of their products. It has been a settled policy with them never to trust to any one means of transport, but to develop one, wherever practicable, side by side with the other. A pertinent remark made by our Consul-General at New York, in his last report, is virtually unheeded by us. "But for the canals," he says, "rail-road combinations would be all-powerful and able to dictate their own terms all the year round for the transport of freight." It is the wholesome effect of this rivalry that has cheapened transportation to an extent that fills us with amazement, and which we feel directly by its intensifying our agricultural depression. And although American railway managers are ready to boast that "by the lowest transportation charges known in the world the farmer of Kansas, and Nebraska, and Iowa can compete in the markets of Europe with the farmer that lives on the Black Sea and other grain-producing countries in Eastern Europe, thousands of miles nearer to the market," their countrymen, nevertheless, are not prepared to throw themselves in their power by ceasing to improve and develop their waterways. Hence the costly experiments and the untiring efforts of American railway managers to cheapen the cost of conveyance. Every year is witness to some new economy on the railroads. The impossibilities of one year are realities the next. Improvements on the road and the rolling stock, reduction in the tare or dead weight of trains, go on apace, such as it would be sheer folly to expect to find within our railway system. For a parallel to it we must look to our ocean-carrying trade, simply because there we have the excellence and progress that mark the complete absence of

monopoly. The utter neglect of the study of railway economics—which is pursued with so much assiduity, not only in the United States, but in every other leading country, as well as in India and our own colonies—is in itself a significant indication of the want of any adequate stimulus to improvement in our railway system.

That, as a people, we are singular in neglecting our waterways and leaving an unqualified monopoly to our railway companies, we are reminded by the attention bestowed by the various European Governments at the present time on the importance of water carriage. The correspondent of the *Times*¹ at Berlin communicates that, “the Government is concerning itself with a plan for uniting, by a system of canals, the Elbe, the Weser, the Ems, the Rhine, and the Meuse. It is also favourable to the proposal of English capitalists to connect the Baltic and the North Sea by a deep-draught canal from Kiel to some portion of the Elbe, hoping that the realisation of all these plans would thus connect Kiel with the Rhine by a direct route, and join the German canals with the waterways of Holland, Belgium, and France.”² It is not only yesterday or to-day that the Germans have begun to give serious attention to their inland navigation; they have for years been busy improving and extending it, and elaborating means towards greater economy in water transport. So much progress were they making in this direction that the French took alarm at the relative cost of carriage in France and Germany. The French Government considered that the industry of France could not hold its own against Germany unless minerals and raw produce were carried at cheaper rates than by their railways. The result of very exhaustive inquiries, while M. de Freycinet was Minister of Public Works, was to prove a saving of from 34 to 40 francs for every 100 tons of heavy merchandise conveyed a mile by canal, compared with the most economical railway charges. This meant that the work could be done by water at from two-fifths to one-third the lowest price at which it could be done by rail. Hence, as is well known, the decision of the French Government for a gradual expenditure of £40,000,000 to improve the harbours, rivers, and canals of the country.

The protectionist policy of Prince Bismarck has been carried to the extent of hampering the transit trade between Germany, Russia, and Austria—the interchange of traffic between the railway companies being impeded and high rates charged. Agreements made between some of the companies for through traffic were ordered by the powerful Minister to be cancelled. Austria at least is taking measures to checkmate this movement. The Austro-

(1) June 22nd, 1881.

(2) Later information is to the effect that preliminary investigations are so far advanced, there is a prospect of an application being made shortly to the Prussian Parliament for a vote of money for the project.

Hungarian lines have made arrangements with the steamers on the River Elbe, and the traffic has already become considerable; and a new company, under Austrian auspices, has been formed for navigating the Elbe and the North Sea with a line of steamers. The rates on the line to Gustavsburg on the Rhine being favourable, traffic is also attracted in that direction. The Vienna correspondent of the *Economist*¹ further mentions that the question of improving navigation on the Danube is at last being seriously discussed by the Hungarian Government. The opinion begins to spread everywhere that it is the hindrance to which navigation is subjected on the Danube that prevents Austria-Hungary from competing successfully with America in the supply of corn. Besides the improvement of the river near the Iron Gate, the chain navigation, now carried on between Vienna and Presburg only, must be extended as far as the Bavarian frontier, and from thence to Ulm and Wurtemberg. Both the Bavarian and Wurtemberg Governments are disposed to grant a concession for carrying this out, and the only remaining difficulty is the objection made by the Hungarian Government to concede a sole privilege for chain navigation. There is already a society prepared to enter into competition with the Danube Steam Navigation Company in chain navigation. This prospect of free competition and improvement in the navigation of the Danube is further enhanced by the report of the successful experiments recently carried out at Krems by Major Lauer, of the Austrian Engineers, by the new method that he has invented for blasting rocks under water. "The special scientific and technical men and jury of experts who witnessed the experiments," it is reported, "were so well satisfied, that a sum of 10,000 florins was subscribed to enable him to carry out some further trials on a gigantic scale. This it is expected he will shortly do at the Iron Gates of the Danube." A bold and important project also is at present occupying the financial world of Vienna for establishing a new commercial route between the Baltic and the Black Sea. It is proposed to make a canal to join the rivers Dniester and Vistula, and thus to bring Odessa into direct communication with Dantzic. Although the work is estimated to cost twenty millions sterling, the most sanguine views prevail regarding its realisation. With this scheme is associated another of scarcely less importance, which aims at cutting a canal to connect the Danube and the Oder, whereby Austria would have an additional medium of commercial communication.

Even in Holland the waterways are receiving attention. Last July the First Chamber of the States-General voted a sum of 3½ million florins for improving the canal from Rotterdam to the sea; and almost at the same time the same assembly, agreeing with the

(1) July 30th.

Lower Chamber, settled a question which has for some years agitated the Dutch commercial community, by approving a scheme for a new canal to be cut from Amsterdam to Utrecht, and thence to the Merwede river, near Gorcum. The Dutch merchants have been witnessing Antwerp year by year monopolising the Rhenish trade, until now the Belgian port, whose commerce not long ago could not compare with Amsterdam, has outdistanced every other port on the continental side of the North Sea. The entire community of Amsterdam were in favour of a direct canal from their city through the Guelder Valley to the Waal; but other important towns wished to have a canal that would connect them with the Rhine and Amsterdam, and, notwithstanding the vigorous opposition from Amsterdam, the latter has been finally agreed upon. But it is still believed that the citizens of Amsterdam will never rest content until they get the direct canal, even if they have to defray the cost themselves, so much importance do they attach to it as a means towards regaining their former leading commercial position.

Belgium, again, which for so many years gave attention wholly to its railways—much the same as in the United Kingdom—has at last, and especially since the International Congress of Commerce was held at Brussels last autumn, become alive to the importance of “the transport of heavy goods at a small cost by canals and rivers,” if they are to continue to compete in certain industries with other countries. The canal at Charleroi is being enlarged, a central canal is being made, and uniformity of gauge is in progress. Companies also are being formed for the forwarding of through traffic by water; and the aim kept in view is to reduce through rates to the level of maritime rates.

In concluding this review it may be mentioned (and this is the key to the situation) that not only in the continental countries, but in the United States, the inland navigation is owned and controlled by the respective Governments. It is not left, as with us, a prey to the aggressive instincts and overmastering power of the railway interests.

All these circumstances considered, when we come to regard the extraordinary stimulus which has been given to production by cheap transportation in the United States, we should at the same time credit the American people with the remarkable vigilance they have displayed in setting one power against another—in simultaneous development of water carriage against rail wherever possible. And when, for instance, we are told authoritatively that the carriage of the raw materials of our iron industries costs nearly double what it does in France, Belgium, Germany, or the United States; or when we hear it reiterated that preferential rates are given to foreign over home produce; we should not be so ready to make complaint of our

railway companies for their extortion and capriciousness, as to blame ourselves for our apathy in leaving the commercial progress of the country at their disposal. For all practical purposes in the way of competition our canals might as well not exist.¹ "The most important method by which the railway companies have defeated the competition of canals has been the purchase of important links in the system of navigation and the discouragement of through traffic. . . . The independent canals make special and favourable through rates; but the railway companies refuse to make similar rates on their parts of the system; and in some cases charge a bar toll, *i.e.* a large and almost prohibitory toll on barges entering their canals from the independent canals." These words are taken from the Report of the Joint Select Committee of 1872; a report which contained a fairly comprehensive statement of the injurious subordination of our inland navigation to the railway system, but which miserably failed in formulating any practical remedy. Out of nearly 4,200 miles of inland navigation in the United Kingdom, fully 40 per cent. have been either purchased, leased, or subsidised by the railway companies, so that as a factor in competition they have been rendered innocuous. The Midland Association, composed of nine railway companies and five or six navigation companies, and the Humber Agreement, which is a similar association—combinations for uniformity of rates—are typical of the helpless condition into which the trade of the country has sunk. When we hear further, as given in evidence by numerous witnesses before the Select Committee on Railway Rates, which has just concluded its labours for this session, that the railway companies are gradually developing ports to suit their own purposes, the eyes of the public ought surely to be opened to the danger that threatens them. Docks on the Tyne, on the Tees at Middlesborough, and at West Hartlepool, owned by one railway company alone (the same company is prepared to purchase the docks of Sunderland), are used to the detriment of Hull and the districts of which Hull is the distributor. The same is true of Fleetwood and Barrow—docks owned actually or virtually by the railway companies, and used to the detriment of Liverpool, and the towns and districts of which it is the natural channel of communication. The same applies elsewhere. Longer distances at lower rates to bring traffic by their own ports—this is the usual resort of the railway companies. Their ports are nursed in spite of every anomaly that is transparent in their action. The crowning result of our policy bids fair of accomplishment very shortly, namely, that the railways will virtually command all our ports, as they now command as many of our canals as they care to possess, unless arrested in their

(1) Canals are statistically out of existence, so far as public information from the Board of Trade is concerned.

progress; of which as yet there is little apparent sign. Then the extinction of our coasting navigation would follow (in many instances even now it is in combination with the railway interest), the last restraining link would be broken, and the industrial destiny of the country would be wholly at the mercy of the railway oligarchy that we have permitted to usurp authority over us.

That we hear of extortion and capriciousness in railway charges, that British railway management has not advanced beyond the empiric stage, that railway economics are an unknown study to our engineers and traffic managers, that no effort is made towards cheapening transport; and that, as a result, and notwithstanding the heavy volume of traffic on our lines, we have the highest railway charges of any leading country, without any of the compensating advantages from water carriage—is no more than we should expect from such an unqualified monopoly as we have given to our railway companies. It is very well to talk of anomalies in our railway rates, but while the best energies of the ablest engineers in Europe and America are devoted to the cheapening of transport by the improvement and extension of waterways—at a period, too, when the trade between the east and west has been revolutionised by the opening of the Suez Canal, when the isthmus of Panama is about to be pierced, as well as that of Corinth, and while other great works of a similar kind are projected—is it not a greater anomaly that the British people should remain listless spectators of the changes taking place around them? What will it avail to do the carrying business of the world, and how long will that proud position be maintained, if our own trade begins to dwindle away, from not having reaped in time, like other nations, the advantages of water carriage for the heavier commodities and the raw materials of our industries, and all the coincident gains from a railway system stimulated by active and sustained competition?

W. FLEMING.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.—III.

THE TRUE METROPOLIS—MECCA.

IN my last paper I sketched the position of the Ottoman Sultans towards the mass of Orthodox Islam, and showed the foundations on which their tenure of the Caliphal title rested. These I explained to be neither very ancient nor very securely laid in the faith and affections of the faithful; and, though at the present moment a certain reaction in favour of Constantinople had set in, it was due to accidental circumstances, which are unlikely to become permanent, and was very far indeed from being universal. It may be as well to recapitulate the position.

The Sunite or Orthodox Mohammedan world holds it as a dogma of faith that there must be a Khalifeh, the ex-officio head of their religious polity, and the successor of their prophet. In temporal matters, whoever holds this office is theoretically king of all Islam; and in spiritual matters he is their supreme religious authority. But practically, the Caliph's temporal jurisdiction has for many centuries been limited to such lands as he could hold by arms; while in spiritual matters he has exercised no direct authority whatever. Nevertheless, he represents to Mussulmans something of which they are in need, and which they are bound to respect; and it cannot be doubted that in proper hands, and at the proper moment, the Caliphate might once more become an instrument for good or evil of almost universal power in Islam. Even now, were there to be an apprehension of general and overwhelming danger for religion, it is to the Caliph that the faithful would look to defend their interests; and, as we have seen, a moderate show of piety and respect for the sacred law has been sufficient, in spite of a violent political opposition, to secure for the actual holder of the title a degree of sympathy which no other Mussulman prince could at any cost of good government have obtained.

On the other hand, it has been shown that the loyalty, such as there is, which Abd el Hamid inspires is due to him solely as incumbent of the Caliphal office, and not as the representative of any race or dynasty. The House of Othman, as such, represents nothing sacred to Mussulmans; and the Turkish race is very far from being respected in Islam. The present Caliphal house is unconnected in blood with the old traditional line of "successors;" and even with the Turks themselves inspires little modern reverence. Moreover, the actual incumbent of the office is thought to be not even a true

Ottoman, being the offspring of the Seraglio rather than of known parents; Abd el Hamid's sole title to spiritual consideration is his official name. This he has had the sense to set prominently forward. Reduced to a syllogism, Mussulman loyalty may be read thus: There must be a Caliph, and the Caliphate deserves respect; there is no other Caliph but Abd el Hamid; ergo, Abd el Hamid deserves respect.

It has been pointed out, however, that, if the Sultan's recent revival of spiritual pretensions is his present strength, it may also in the immediate future become his weakness. The challenge which the old Constantinople school of Hanefism threw down ten years ago to the world has been taken up; and all the learned world now knows the frailty of the House of Ottoman's spiritual position. The true history of the Caliphate has been published and set side by side with that Turkish history which the ignorance of a previous generation had come to confound with it. At the present day nobody with any instruction doubts that Abd el Hamid and his house might be legally displaced by the first successful rival, and that the only right of Constantinople to lead Islam is the right of the sword. As long as the Ottoman Empire is maintained and no counter Caliph appears, so long will the Sultan be the acknowledged head of religion; but not a day longer. The Caliphate, for one alien as Abd el Hamid is to the Koreysh, must be constantly maintained in arms, and on the first substantial success of a new pretender his present following would fall off from him without compunction, transferring to this last their loyalty on precisely the same ground on which Abd el Hamid now receives it. Abd el Hamid would then be legitimately deposed and disappear, for it is unlikely that he would find any such protector in his adversity as the legitimate Caliphs found in theirs six hundred years ago. So fully is this state of things recognised by the Ulema, that I found the opinion last year to be nearly universal that Abd el Hamid was destined to be the last Caliph of the House of Othman.

It becomes, therefore, a question of extreme interest, and this shall be the subject of my present paper, to consider who among Mussulman princes could, with any chance of being generally accepted by orthodox Islam, put in a claim to replace the Ottoman dynasty as Caliph when the day of its doom shall have been reached. It is a question which ought certainly to interest Englishmen, for on its solution the whole problem of Mussulman loyalty or revolt in India most probably depends, and though it would certainly be unwise, at the present moment, for an English Government to obtrude itself violently in a religious quarrel not yet ripe, much might be done in a perfectly legitimate way to influence the natural course of events and direct it to a channel favourable to

British interests. Is there then in Islam, east, or west, or south, a man of sufficient eminence and courage to proclaim himself Caliph, in the event of Abd el Hamid's political collapse or death? What would be his line of action to secure Mohammedan acceptance? Where should he fix his capital, and on what arms should he rely? Whose flag should he display? Above all—for this is the question that interests us most—could such a change of rulers affect favourably the future thought and life of Islam, and lead to an honest Moslem reformation? These questions, which are being cautiously asked of each other by thoughtful Mussulmans in every corner of the east, I now propose to consider and, as far as it is my power, to answer.

I have said that Islam is already well prepared for change. Whatever Europeans may think of a future for the Ottoman Empire, Mussulmans are profoundly convinced that on its present basis it will not long survive. Even in Turkey, the thought of its political regeneration as an European Empire has been at last abandoned, and no one now contemplates more than a few years further tenure of the Bosphorus. Twenty years ago it was not so, nor perhaps five, but to-day all are resigned to this. Ancient prophecy and modern superstition alike point to a return of the Crescent into Asia as an event at hand, and to the doom of the Turks as a race which has corrupted Islam. A well-known prediction to this effect, which has for ages exercised its influence on the vulgar and even the learned Mohammedan mind, gives the year 1883 of our era as the term within which these things are to be accomplished, and places the scene of the last struggle in Northern Syria, at Homs, on the Orontes. Islam is then finally to retire from the north, and the Turkish rule to cease. Such prophecies often work their own fulfilment, and the feeling of a coming catastrophe is so deeply rooted and so universal that I question whether the proclamation of a Jihad by the Sultan would now induce a thousand Moslems to fight voluntarily against the Cross in Europe. The Sultan himself and the old Turkish party which supports him, while clinging obstinately in appearance to all their ground, really have their eyes turned elsewhere than on Adrianople and Salonica and the city of the Roman Emperors. It is unlikely that a new advance of the Christian Powers from the Balkan would meet again with more than formal opposition; and Constantinople itself, unsupported by European aid, would be abandoned without a blow, or with only such show of resistance as the Sheriat requires for a cession of territory.¹ The Sultan would, in such an event, pass into Asia, and I have been credibly informed that his own plan is to make not Broussa, but Bagdad or Damascus his capital. This he considers would be more

(1) According to Canon Law the Caliph cannot cede any portion of the lands of Islam except on compulsion.

in conformity with Caliphal traditions, and the Caliphate would gain strength by a return to its old centres. Damascus is surnamed by theologians *Bab el Kaaba*, Gate of the Caaba; and there or at Bagdad, the traditional city of the Caliphs, he would build up once more a purely theocratic empire. Such, they say, is his thought; and such doubtless would be the empire of the future that Mussulmans would choose. Only it is improbable that it would continue to be in any sense Ottoman, or that Abd el Hamid would have the opportunity of himself establishing it. The loss of Constantinople would be a blow to his prestige he could not well recover from, and no new empire ever yet was founded on defeat. What is far more likely to happen is that, in such an event, Abd el Hamid and his house would disappear and an entirely new order of Caliphal succession take their place. Even without supposing any such convulsion to the empire as a loss of the Bosphorus, his reign will hardly be a long one. The Ulema of Constantinople are by no means all on his side, and the party of "Young Turkey," cowed for the moment by the terrorism which there prevails, is his bitter enemy, and will not let him rest. It will infallibly, on the next danger from Europe, show its head again and take its revenge. It is said to be the programme of this party, when it next comes to power, to separate the spiritual functions of the Caliphate from those of the head of the State, copying, in so far, the modern practice of Christendom towards the Papacy. I suppose that it would be attempted to restore that state of things which, as we have already seen, existed at Cairo in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and it is just conceivable that, as far as Turkey itself was concerned, such an arrangement might, for a time, succeed. There would then be two powers at Constantinople, a *Maire du Palais* who would reign, and a Caliph who would be head of religion;—a separation of offices which would certainly facilitate the sort of reform that Midhat and his friends desire. But to the world at large the event would only signify that Constantinople had formally abdicated her claim to leadership, and Islam would never acknowledge as Caliph, the mere puppet of an irreligious clique of officials because he happened to be a member of the Beni Othman. His political power is the only thing that reconciles Islam with an Ottoman Caliph and without sovereignty he would be discarded. In whatever way, therefore, that we look at it, there seems justification in probability for the conviction already cited that after Abd el Hamid a new order of Caliphal succession will be seen.

It seems to be an universal opinion at the present day among those who think at all upon the matter, that whatever change may be impending for Islam, it will be in the direction of concentration rather than of extension. All parties see that the day of outside conquest is at an end, and that the utmost that Islam can look forward

to politically is the maintenance of its present positions, and as an extreme possibility the emancipation of its lost provinces in India and North Africa from Christian rule. There is, therefore, a conviction that the removal of the seat of supreme authority, when made, will be towards the centre, not to any new extremity of Islam. Constantinople, even if all Islam were combined for its defence, is felt to be too near the infidel frontier to be safe, and, cosmopolitan city as it has become, it is by many looked upon itself as infidel. A position further removed from danger and more purely Mohammedan is the necessity of the day; and it can hardly be doubted that, when the time comes, the possession of some such vantage ground will be recognised as a first qualification with whoever shall assume the leadership of Islam. We have seen that Abd el Hamid dreams of Damascus or Bagdad. But others dream of Cairo as the new seat of the Caliphate; and to the majority of far-sighted Mussulmans it is rapidly becoming apparent that the retreat, once begun, must be conducted further still, and that the only true resting-place for theocracy is in Arabia, its birthplace and the fountain-head of its inspiration. There, alone in the world, all the conditions for the independent exercise of religious sovereignty are to be found. In Arabia there are neither Christians nor Jews nor infidels of any sort for Islam to count with, nor is it so rich a possession that it should ever excite the cupidity of the Western Powers. A Caliph there need fear no admonition from Frank ambassadors in virtue of any capitulations; he would be free to act as the Successor of the Apostle should, and would breathe the pure air of an unadulterated Islam. A return, therefore, to Medina or Mecca is the probable future of the Caliphate.

The importance of Arabia has of late years been fully recognised both at Constantinople and elsewhere. It has been the sustained policy of Abd el Hamid at all cost and by whatsoever means to maintain his influence there; and he knows that without it his spiritual pretensions could have no secure foundations. Arabia, he perceives, is the main point of the Caliphal problem; and whether or not the future holder of the office reside in Hejaz, it is certain that by its tenure alone the Mohammedan world will judge of his right to be their leader. It will, therefore, before we go further, be interesting to examine the relations existing in the past and present between Mecca and the Caliphate, and to ascertain the position now held by Abd el Hamid in Arabia. On this point I believe that I can offer information which will be both valuable and new.

The political constitution of the Moslem Holy Land is one of the most anomalous in the world. Like every district of Arabia proper, Hejaz has a town and a nomad population, but almost no intermediate agricultural class. The townsmen I have already described

—a multitude of mixed origin, descended from such pilgrims as from every quarter of the globe have visited the Holy Places, and have remained to marry and die in them. The Nomads, on the contrary, are a pure race, of a peculiarly noble type, and unchanged in any essential feature of their life from what they were in the days of Mohammed. They are warlike, unquiet Bedouins, camel-riders (for they have no horses), and armed with matchlocks; and they are proud of their independence, and tenacious of their rights. No serious attempt has ever been made, except by Mehemet Ali, to subdue them, and none at all has succeeded. Unlike the generality of Peninsular Bedouins, however, they are professed Sunite Mohammedans, if not of a very pious type; and they acknowledge as their chief the head of their most noble tribe, the Grand Sherif of the Koreysh, who is also Prince of Mecca. The Koreysh is still a distinct nomadic tribe, inhabiting the immediate neighbourhood of Mecca; not numerous, but not in decay. They are divided into several sections, each governed by its Sheykh, the chief of which, the Abadleh, has for several centuries supplied the reigning family of Hejaz. This last traces its descent from Ali ibn Abutaleb, the fourth Caliph, through his son Hassan, and through Ali's wife, Fatmeh, from Mohammed himself. It is probably the oldest authentic male descent in the world, and certainly the most sacred. All the members of this Abadleh family enjoy the title of Sherif, the head of it only being distinguished as the Sherif el Kebir, the Great or Grand Sherif. The rest of the Koreysh, not being descended from Fatmeh, do not receive the title. All alike wear the Bedouin dress of abba and kefiyeh, even the Prince himself, standing in this strikingly in contrast with the Hejazi citizens, who affect the turban and gombaz.

The district of Medina is occupied by the Harb Bedouins, a larger and more powerful tribe than the Koreysh, who also recognise the Sherif, but their allegiance is precarious, while to the east and south of Mecca the Ateybeh and Assir, more powerful still, are wholly independent. It has always been a difficult matter to keep these unruly elements at peace with each other and with the citizens, nor could the Sherif hope to effect it were he not himself of Bedouin and noble blood.

The early history of the Sherifate is exceedingly obscure. When the Caliphs definitely abandoned Medina as their capital in the fortieth year of Islam (A.D. 662), they for a time left deputies of the Sherifal family behind them to govern in their name, and, as long as the Ommiad and Abbaside dynasties continued at Damascus and Bagdad, their sovereignty was acknowledged in Hejaz. But on the destruction of the Arabian Caliphate in 1259, the Sherifal family seems to have set itself up independently, relying only on the casual

help of the Egyptian Sultans and the Imams of Sana to protect them against the Bedouins of Nejd and Assir, now hardly any longer, even in name, Mohammedans. The Egyptian Sultan, however, was the titular protector of the Holy Places, and it was he who transmitted the *Surrah*, or religious contributions made by the Faithful, and provided escort for the yearly pilgrimage made to the shrines. Thus we read of Kaïd Beg having rebuilt the Mosque of Medina in 1476, and having sent a yearly subsidy of 7,500 ardebs of corn for the townspeople. Other princes, however, contributed their offerings too, and received titles of honour connected with the Holy Land, the Shahs of Persia, the Moguls, and the Ottomans. The first connection of the latter with Mecca that I can find was in 1413, when the Padishah Mohammed Khan I., having sent a *surrah*, or bag of gold, to the Sherif to be distributed in alms, received from him the title of Khaddam el Harameyn, servant of the two shrines, and the gift being continued annually by the Ottoman Padishahs may very likely have paved the way to their recognition later as Caliphs.

It would seem singular at first sight that the Sherifs, being themselves of the sacred family whose special inheritance the Caliphate was, should ever thus have recognised a stranger as its legal heir. But the political weakness of the Meccan Government in the sixteenth century must be taken into account as the all-sufficient reason. The Grand Sherif could hardly have stood alone as an independent sovereign, for he was continually menaced on the one side by the dissenting Omani, and on the other by the unbelieving tribes of Nejd, against whom his frontier was defenceless. He could not, with his own resources, protect the pilgrim routes from plunder—and on the pilgrimage all the prosperity of Hejaz depended. It therefore was a necessity with the Meccans to have a protector of some sort; and Sultan Kansaw having fallen, they accepted Sultan Selim.

The Ottoman Sultans then became protectors of the Holy Places, and were acknowledged Caliphs without any appeal to arms at Mecca and Medina. Their weapons were, in fact, the gold and silver pieces with which they subsidised the Sherifs. Sultan Suliman at once, on being acknowledged, ordered an additional annuity of 5,000 ardebs to be paid to Mecca, and he and his immediate successors carried out at their own expense such public works as the shrines required in the way of repairs or improvements. Subsequently the seaport of Jeddah, formerly occupied by the Egyptians, received a Turkish contingent, but the interior of Hejaz was never subjugated, nor was any tax at any time levied. Only once a year an Ottoman army appeared before the walls of Medina, conducting the pilgrims from Damascus and convoying the *surrah*. The state of things at Mecca in the last century has been clearly sketched by Niebuhr. The Sherifs were in reality independent princes, but they "gratified the

vanity of the Grand Signior," by calling him their suzerain, he on his side occasionally exercising the right of power by deposing the reigning Sherif and appointing another of the same family. No kind of administration had then been attempted by the Turks in Hejaz.

Mehemet Ali's occupation of Hejaz in 1812 first brought foreign troops inland. He established himself at Taïf, the summer residence of the Meccans; deposed the Grand Sherif Ghaleb, and appointed in his stead another member of the Sherifal family; declaring the Sultan sovereign of the country—acts which the Meccans acquiesced in through dread of the Wahhabis from whom Mehemet Ali promised to deliver them. The Egyptian and Turkish Governments have thus, during the present century, exercised some of the functions of sovereignty in Hejaz.

At the present moment Sultan Abd el Hamid's position in the country is this. His troops occupy Jeddah and Yembo, the two seaports, and the towns of Medina and Taif in the interior. He is acknowledged by the Sherifs as sovereign, except in Mecca; and he appoints to all the principal offices of State, including the supreme office of the Grand Sherifate itself. He is represented by a Pasha who resides alternately at Jeddah and Taif according to the season, but who has not the right of entering Mecca without the Grand Sherif's leave, or of sending troops there. The total garrison of the Turks in Hejaz last winter was from 8,000 to 10,000 men, of whom 4,000 only were regulars (Nizam), and efficient. While I was at Jeddah, the Medina garrison of 2,000 regulars, having been long unpaid and unrationed, was said to be living on public charity. On the other hand the Hejazi Bedouins do not acknowledge any sovereignty but that of the Sherif, nor could the Sultan pretend to keep order outside the towns except through the Sherif's interposition. The Sultan levies no tax in the interior or impost of any kind, and the sole revenue he receives in Hejaz comes from Customs duties of Jeddah and Yembo, which may amount to £40,000.

In return for this he also is bound to transmit every year at the time of the pilgrimage sums of money collected by him from the revenues of the Wakaf within his dominions, lands settled by pious persons on the Sherifal family. These are said to amount to nearly half a million sterling, and are distributed amongst all the principal personages of Hejaz. The transmission of the Wakaf income in which the Sultan constitutes himself, so to say, the Sherif's agent, is in fact the real bond which unites Hejaz with the Caliphate, and its distribution gives the Sultan patronage, and with it power in the country. The bond, however, is one of interest only. The Sherifs, proud of their sacred ancestry, look upon the Turkish Caliphs as barbarians and impostors, while the Sultans find the Hejaz a heavy charge upon their revenue. Either hates and despises the other, the patron and

the patronised ; and, save that their union is a necessity, it would long ago have, by mutual consent, been dissolved. The Sherif depends upon the Sultan because he needs a protector, and needs his Wakaf. The Sultan depends upon the Sherif, because recognition by Hejaz as the protector is a chief title to his Caliphate. Mecca, in fact, is a necessity to Islam even more than a Caliph ; and whoever is sovereign there is naturally sovereign of the Mussulman world.

Outside Hejaz the Sultan holds what he holds of Arabia merely by force. I have described already in the pages of this Review the growing power of Ibn Rashid, the Prince of Nejd ; and since that time, two years ago, he has sensibly extended and confirmed his influence there. He has now brought into his alliance all the important tribes of northern Arabia, including the powerful Ateybeh, who, a few months ago, were threatening Mecca ; and in Hejaz his name is already as potent as the Sultan's. He offered, while I was at Jeddah, to undertake the whole convoy of the Damascus pilgrimage with his own troops, as already he convoys that from Persia ; while I have quite recent information of a campaign against his only rivals, the Ibn Saouds, which he has just brought to a successful conclusion. In Yemen, the other neighbour of the Meccans, 20,000 Turkish troops are required to garrison the few towns the Sultan calls his own, and were it not for the facility given him by the possession of the sea-coast, these could not long hope to hold their ground. Every day I am expecting news there of a revolt, and the first sign of weakness at Constantinople will certainly precipitate a war of independence in that part of Arabia.

We may expect, therefore, in the event of such a break-up as I have suggested to be likely of the Ottoman power—either through loss of territory or by the growing impoverishment of the empire, which needs must, in a few decades, end in atrophy—to see among Mussulman princes a competition for the right of protecting the Holy Places, and with it of inheriting the Caliphal title. The Sultan reduced to Asia Minor, even if he retain Armenia and Kurdistan (which is extremely improbable), would be quite unable to afford himself the expensive luxury of holding his Arabian conquests and buying the patronage of Mecca. He would be unable any longer to overawe the Red Sea, or secure the pilgrim routes. The Princes of Nejd would certainly not tolerate the presence of Turkish soldiers at Medina, and the Sherifs of Mecca would have to make terms with them and with the restored Imams of Yemen till such time as they should find a new protector elsewhere. Above all, the half million of Wakaf income would no longer be forthcoming, and a Turkish Emir el Haj arriving empty-handed at Mecca would bring his master to a climax of derision. Hejaz then would infal-

libly look out for a new potentate whom she could dignify with the title of Hami el Haremeyn and Emir el Mumenin; and if there were none forthcoming, would herself proclaim a Caliphate. Let us look, therefore, at the lands of Islam to see in which of them a competent Prince of the Faithful is likely to appear.

It is possible, though to European eyes it will seem far from probable, that out of the ferment which we are now witnessing in the Barbary States, some leader of real power and religious distinction may arise who shall possess the talent of banding together into an instrument of power the immense but scattered forces of Islam in Northern Africa, and achieving some signal success against the new French policy, establish himself in Tripoli or Tunis in independent sovereignty. Were such another man as Abd el Kader to arise, a saint, a preacher, and a soldier, indifferent to the petty aims of local power and gifted with military genius, true piety, and an eloquent tongue, I believe at the present day he might achieve at least a partial success. The French army is weaker in discipline and confidence compared to what it was in Abd el Kader's day, and it has a far more difficult frontier to defend; while the Government at home is but half resolute, and the Arabs command much floating sympathy in Europe and elsewhere. I do not say the thing is likely, but it is conceivable; and Africa contains the elements of a possible new sovereignty for some Mussulman prince which might eventually lead him on the road to Mecca. It is undoubted that with the prestige of success against a Christian Power, and backed by the vast populations of Soudan and the fierce military fervour of the Malekite Arabs, an Abd el Kader or an Ibn Saoud would attract the sympathy of Islam, and might aspire to its highest dignity. But enormous postulates must be granted before we can look on any one now known to fame in Africa as a probable candidate for the future Caliphate. The present leaders of the Arabs are but local heroes, and as yet they have achieved nothing which can command respect. In Tripoli there is indeed a saint of very high pretensions, one known as the Sheykh Es Snusi, who has a large religious following, and who has promised to come forward shortly as the Mohady or guide expected by a large section of the Sunite as well as the Shi'ite Mussulmans. Next year he will attain the age of forty (the legal age of a prophet), and he may be expected to take a prominent part in any general movement that may then be on foot. But as yet we know nothing of him but his name and the fact of his sanctity, which is of Wahhabite type. Moreover, even supposing all that may be supposed of a possible success, there yet lies Egypt and the Suez Canal between the Barbary State and Mecca, so that I think we may be justified in these days of steam fleets and electric cables and European concerts,

if we treat Africa as out of probable calculations in considering the future of the Caliphate. It is remarkable that the Sultan of Morocco, Sherif though he be, has taken as yet no apparent part in the religious movement of modern Barbary.

The Mussulman princes of India hold a very similar position. Opposed as they soon may be, indeed must be if the unintelligent English policy of the last twenty years be persevered in, to an European Government in arms, they will have the chance of making themselves a leading position in the eyes of Islam; and should a Mohammedan empire arise once more at Delhi or Hyderabad, India would certainly become *par excellence* the Dar el Islam. It would then be by far the richest and most populous of Mohammedan states, and able to outbid any other with the surrah it could send to Mecca. The Wakaf property in India at the present day is supposed to be as valuable as that in the Ottoman empire, and it would then become a source of patronage with the Government, instead of being privately remitted as now. If money alone could buy the Caliphate, a successful leader of revolt against the English in India might dictate his terms to Islam. But again the insuperable obstacle intervenes of distance and the sea. Mussulman India could never give that protection to Mecca that Islam needs, and could not assert its sovereignty anywhere but at home in arms. Even this is assuming, as in the case of Barbary, an enormous postulate—success.

Neither India, then, nor Western Africa can reasonably be expected to supply that substitute for the House of Othman which we need. A more apparent and in the opinion of some a likely candidate for the Caliphate succession may be looked for in the Viceregal family of Egypt. Mohammed Towfik, if he were a man of genius like his grandfather, or if, honest man as he is, he plays his cards with success, might in a few years become an important rival at Mecca to the Sultan. To say nothing of its traditional connection with the Caliphate, Egypt has the more modern recollection of Mehemet Ali to urge upon the Hejazi in its favour as the protecting State of Islam. Mehemet Ali's name and that of his successor Ibrahim Pasha, if not precisely popular, are at least respected at Mecca; and the latter possesses a great title to Sunite gratitude in having destroyed the Wahhabite empire in 1818. I have mentioned Mehemet Ali's ambition; and a similar ambition would seem to have occurred to Ismail, the late Khedive. He, in the plenitude of his financial power, is stated to have expended large sums of money in subsidising the Sherifs with a view to possible contingencies at Constantinople. But unfortunately for him the opening of the Suez Canal, on which he had counted for securing him the support of Europe proved the precise instrument of ruin for

his scheme. The Porte in 1871, scenting danger to its own Caliphal pretensions from this quarter, occupied the Red Sea in force, reinforced its garrisons in Jeddah and Yembo, advanced to Taïf, and threw a large army into Yemen. This was alone made possible by the Canal, and Ismail to his chagrin found himself "hoist with his own petard." Mohammed Towfik, therefore, would have some excuse in family tradition if he indulged occasionally in dreams of a similar nature. His connection with Mecca is at the present day second only to that of Constantinople; the Egyptian Khedivieh line of steamers ply constantly between Suez and Jeddah; and the Haj the Khedive sends to Mecca, including as it does most of the Mogrebbin pilgrims, is more numerous than the Sultan's. He maintains intimate relations with one at least of the great Sherifal families, and sends a Mahmol yearly with an important surrah to Medina. Mohammed Towfik also has the deserved reputation of being a sincere Mussulman and an honest man, and it is certain that a large section of true liberal opinion looks to him as the worthiest supporter of its views. With all this I doubt if he be big enough a man to aspire as yet with success to Abd el Hamid's succession. The present Viceroy's financial position, though we may hope sounder in its base, is not so immediately powerful as his father's; and much ready money will be required by an aspirant to the Caliphate. His fighting power, too, is small, and he would have to proclaim himself in arms. Moreover—and this I fear will remain an insuperable difficulty—he is hampered with the control of Europe. Islam would hardly obey another Caliph who was himself obedient to Christendom; and the same causes which have ruined the House of Othman, would also ruin him. A Caliph, as things stand, cannot legally govern, except by the old canon law of the Sheriat, and though a lapsus from strict observance may be tolerated in an ordinary prince, or even in a well established Caliph, a new Caliph putting forward a new claim would be more strictly bound. How could Mohammed Towfik's necessity to Islam be reconciled to his necessity to Europe? Between the two stools he hardly could avert a fall.

Unless, then, some unexpected religious hero should appear in Eastern Asia, of which as yet there is no sign, we are driven to Arabia for a solution of the difficulty where to establish a Mussulman theocracy, and to the Sherifal family of Mecca itself for a new dynasty.

The family of the Sherifs has this vast advantage over any other possible competitor to the supreme title of Islam that it is of the acknowledged blood of that tribe of Koreysh which Mohammed himself designated as his heirs. Amongst many other passages of authority which bear upon the rights of the Koreysh the following

seem to me the most explicit and the best worth quoting: "The prophet," says a tradition of Omm Hani, daughter of Abutaleb, "exalted the Koreysh by conferring on them seven prerogatives: the first, the *Nebbwat* (the fact that they had given birth to a prophet); the second, the *Khalafat* (the succession); the third, the *Hejabat* (the guardianship of the Kaaba); the fourth, the *Sikayat* (the right of supplying water to the Haj); the fifth, the *Refudat* (the right of entertaining the Haj); the sixth, the *Nedwat* (the right of counsel, government); and the seventh, the *Leua* (possession of the banner, with the right of proclaiming war)." The prophet also, according to another tradition, said, "As long as there remains one man of the Koreysh, so long shall that man be my successor;" and as to the Arab race, "If the Arab race falls Islam shall fall." All the world knows these things, and to the popular mind, especially, the Sherif is already far more truly the representative of spiritual rank than any Sultan or Caliph is. The vast populations of Southern and Eastern Asia send out their pilgrims, not to Constantinople but to Mecca, and it is the Sherif whom they find there supreme. The Turkish Government in Hejaz holds a comparatively insignificant position, and the Sultan's representative at Jeddah is hardly more than servant to the Prince of Mecca. It is he who is the descendant of their prophet, not the other, and though the learned may make distinctions in favour of the Caliph the Haj only hears of the Sherif. Even at Constantinople, by immemorial custom, the Sultan rises to receive members of the sacred family; and at Mecca it is commonly said that should a Sultan make the Haj in person he would be received by the Grand Sherif as an inferior. The Sherifal family, then, is surrounded with a halo of religious prestige which would make their acquisition of the supreme temporal title appear natural to all but the races who have been in subjection to the Ottomans, and were a man of real ability to appear amongst them he would, in the crisis we have foreseen, be sure to find an almost universal following.

That the Ottoman Government is perfectly aware of this is certain. Even in the days of its greatest power it always showed its jealousy and distrust of Mecca, and was careful when any of the Grand Sherifs acquired what was considered dangerous influence to supplant him by setting up a rival. Its physical power enabled it to do this, and though it could not abolish the office of the Grand Sherifate it could interfere in the order of succession. Family feuds have, therefore, been at all times fostered by the Turks in Hejaz, and will be, as long as their presence there is tolerated. An excellent example of their system has recently been given in the episode of the late Grand Sherif's death, and the story of it will serve also to show the fear entertained by the present Sultan of this his great spiritual rival.

To tell it properly I must go back to the epoch of the Wahhabite invasion of Hejaz in 1808.

At that time, and for the latter half of the previous century, the supreme dignity of the Sherifal House was held by a branch of it known as the Dewy Zeyd (the word *Dewy* is used in Hejaz, as are elsewhere *Beni* or *Ahl*, meaning *people, family, house*), which had replaced in 1750 the Barakat branch, mentioned by Niebuhr as in his day supreme. The actual holder of the title was Ghaleb ibn Mesaad, and he, finding himself unable to contend against the Wahhabis, became himself a Wahhabi. Consequently, when Mehmet Ali appeared at Mecca in 1812, his first act was to depose this Ghaleb, in spite of his protest that he had returned to orthodoxy, and to appoint another member of the Sherifal House in his place. The Sherif chosen was Yalia ibn Scrur, of a rival branch, the Dewy Aoun, and a bitter animosity was, by this means, engendered between the two families of Aoun and Zeyd, which is continued to the present day. Nor, as may be supposed, was this lessened by the subsequent changes rung by the Turkish and Egyptian Governments in their appointments to the office, for, in 1827, we find Abd el Mutalleb, the son of the deposed Wahhabite Ghaleb, reappointed, and in the following year again, Mohammed, the son of Yahia ibn Aoun, an intrigue which brought on a civil war. Then in 1848 a new intrigue reinstated Abd el Mutalleb and the Zeyds; and then, in 1853, these were again deposed for rebellion, and an Aoun was placed in power. From 1853 till 1880 the Aouns retained the Grand Sherifate and were supreme in Hejaz. Coming into power at a time when Liberal ideas were in the ascendant they have consistently been Liberal, and still represent the more humane and progressive party among the Meccans. In the desert, where all are latitudinarian, they are the popular party; and, though themselves beyond a suspicion of unorthodoxy, they have always shown a tolerant spirit towards the Shiahs and other heretics, with whom the Sherifal authority necessarily comes in contact every year at the Haj. They have even maintained friendly terms with the European element at Jeddah, and as long as they remained in power the relations between India and Mecca were of an amicable nature. Abdallah ibn Aoun, the son of Mohammed, who succeeded his father in 1858, and reigned for nineteen years, was a man of considerable ability, and he is credited with having had views of so advanced a nature as to include the opening of Hejaz to European trade. Nor was his brother, who in 1877 became Grand Sherif, of a less liberal mind. Though of less ability than Abdallah, he is described as eminently humane and virtuous, and it is certain that, with the exception of his hereditary enemies, the Zeyds, he was universally beloved by the Hejazi. So much was this the case that, in the

year following the disastrous Russian war, when Constantinople seemed on the point of dissolution, the Arabs began to talk openly of making El Husseyn ibn Aoun Caliph in the Sultan's place. I have not been able to ascertain that El Husseyn himself indulged the ambitious project of his friends, for he was eminently a man of peace, and the Caliphal title would hardly have given him a higher position than he held. But it is certain that his popularity gave umbrage at Constantinople, the more so as Abd el Hamid could not and dared not depose him. El Husseyn, too, became specially obnoxious to the reactionary party, when it resolved at last to quarrel with England, for he and his family persisted in remaining on friendly terms with the British Government on all occasions when the interest of Indian subjects of her Majesty's came in question at the Haj. For this reason, principally, it would seem his death was resolved on to make room for the agent of a new policy.

On the 14th of March, 1880, Jeddah was the scene of a solemn pageant. The Haj was just over, and the seaport of Mecca crowded with pilgrims was waiting for the Grand Sherif, the descendant of the prophet and the representative of the Sacred House of Ali, to give the blessing of his presence to the last departing votaries. Travelling by night from Mecca, El Husseyn and his retinue appeared at dawn outside the city walls, and when it was morning mounted on a white mare from Nejd, and, preceded by his escort of Koresh Arabs and the Sultan's guard of honour, he rode into the town. The streets of Jeddah are narrow and tortuous, and the way from the gate to the house of Omar Nassif, his agent, where he was accustomed to alight, was thronged with pious folk, who struggled for the privilege of kissing his feet and the hem of his Arab cloak. He had nearly reached the place when an old beggar from the crowd pushed his way forward asking loudly for alms in the name of God. It was an appeal not to be denied, and as the Sherif turned to those near him to order a contribution from the bag kept for such distributions, the old man rose upon him, and drawing a ragged knife (so it was described to me) struck him in the belly. At first, even those who saw the deed hardly knew what had happened, for El Husseyn did not fall or dismount, and without speaking rode on to the house. There he was lifted from his mare and carried to an upper chamber, and in the course of some hours he expired.

Those nearest him, meanwhile, had seized and cudgelled the old man, and some of the escort had taken him to the guard-house. When it became known what had happened, a great cry arose in Jeddah, and old and young, and women and children, and citizens and strangers wept together. I have heard the scene described as one beyond description moving, and the women shrieked and wailed

the whole night long. El Husseyn was beloved, and he was taken in the flower of his manhood.

No satisfactory judicial investigation seems to have been made of the deed, though a formal mejlis was held at Mecca whither the assassin was immediately transferred, and on the fourth day he was publicly executed. Who and what he was it is difficult to determine. The Turkish bulletin on the event described him as a Persian fanatic, but no one confessed to having known him, and those who saw and spoke to him while in custody maintain that he was an Afghan and a Sunite. He seems to have given half-a-dozen contradictory accounts of himself; but the general impression remains that he came from Turkey and was by profession a dervish. He had not come with the Haj, but had been first noticed as a beggar at Mecca ten days before when he had asked and received an alms of the Sherif, and had since been several times found obtrusively in El Husseyn's path. No one at Jeddah holds the Turkish Governor to have been cognisant of the crime. He was personally on good terms with El Husseyn, and has since been disgraced; but all point to the Stamboul Cumarilla and even the Sultan himself as its author. It is known that Abd el Hamid constantly employs dervishes as his spies and private agents, and some who pretend to know best affirm that the old man received his mission directly from the Caliph. I do not affect to decide upon the point, but think the *onus probandi* to lie with those who would deny it. Assassination of a dangerous rival or of too powerful a chieftain has been the resource time out of mind of the Ottoman sovereigns, and they can hardly claim indulgence now from public opinion. The Sheykh of the Dervishes is all powerful with his fanatical followers, and he is the Sultan's servant; a word from him would doubtless have secured the services of twenty such devotees. One circumstance points decidedly to Constantinople. It is known in Jeddah that El Husseyn's successor, who had long been resident at Constantinople, sent orders to his agent at Jeddah to prepare for his return as Grand Sherif two months before El Husseyn, who was a young man, died, and that he had, moreover, dispatched most of his baggage in anticipation. The last words of the old assassin are curious. Having done his deed he seemed quite happy, and neither ate nor drank, but prepared for the next world. A little while before he was executed he related a story. "There was once," he said, "an elephant, a great and noble beast, and to him God sent a gnat, the smallest thing which is. It stung him on the trunk and the elephant died. Allah Kerim: God is merciful."

El Husseyn's successor, the man for whom room was made, and who knew beforehand that it was to be made, was none other than the aged and twice deposed Abd el Mutalleb, the son of the Wahhabite Ghaleb, the fiercest fanatic of the Dewy Zeyd.

I have not room here to describe in detail the effect of this coup d'état on the political aspect of Hejaz. For the moment the reactionary party is in power at Mecca, as it is at Constantinople, Abd el Mutalleb is supported by Turkish bayonets, and the Aoun family and the Liberals are suffering persecution at Mecca, while the Sherifal Court, which had hitherto been most friendly to England, has become the focus of Indian discontent. Outside the town all is disorder. It is sufficient for the present if I have shown that there is in Hejaz an element of spiritual power already existing side by side with the Sultan, of which advantage may one day be taken to provide him with a natural successor. If no new figure should appear on the political horizon of Islam when the Ottoman empire dies sufficiently commanding to attract the allegiance of the Mussulman world (and of such there is as yet no sign), it is certainly to the Sherifal family of Mecca that the mass of Mohammedans would look for a representative of their supreme headship and of that Caliphate of which they stand in need. The transfer of the seat of spiritual power from Constantinople to Mecca would be an easy and natural one, and would hardly disturb the existing ideas of the vulgar, while it would harmonise with all the traditions of the learned. Mecca or Medina would on the extinction of Constantinople become almost of necessity the legal home of the Ahl el Agde, and might easily become the acknowledged centre of spiritual power. All whom I have spoken to on the subject agree that the solution would be an acceptable one to every school of Ulema except the distinctly Turkish schools. Indeed "Mecca, the seat of the Caliphate" is, as far as I have had an opportunity of judging, the cry of the day with Mussulmans; nor is it one likely to lose strength in the future. Like the cry of "Roma capitale," it seems to exercise a strong influence on the imagination of all to whom it is suggested, and when to that is added "a Caliphate from the Koreysh," the idea is to Arabs at least irresistible. How indeed should it be otherwise when we look back on history?

For my own part, though I do not pretend to determine the course events will take, I consider this notion of a return to Mecca decidedly the most probable of all the contingencies we have reviewed, and the one which gives the best promise of renewed spiritual life for Islam. Politically the Caliph at Mecca would of course be less important than now on the Bosphorus; but religiously he would have a far more assured footing. Every year the pilgrimage from every part of the world would visit him, and instead of representing a mere provincial school of thought, he would then be a true metropolitan for all schools and all nations. The Arabian element in Islam would certainly support such a nomination, and it must be remembered that Arabia extends from Marocco to Bushire; and so would the Indian

and the Malay—indeed every element but the Turkish, which is day by day becoming of less importance. I have even heard it affirmed that a Caliphate of the Koreysh at Mecca would go far towards reconciling the Schismatics, Abadhites, and Shiahhs with orthodoxy ; and I have reason to believe that it would so affect the liberal three-quarters of Wahhabism. To the Shiahhs, especially, a descendant of Ali could not but be acceptable ; and to the Arabs of Oman and Yemen a Caliph of the Koreysh would be at least less repugnant than a Caliph of the Beni Othman. There certainly have of late years been symptoms of less bitterness between these schismatics and their old enemies, the Sunites ; and such a change in the conditions of the Caliphate might conceivably bring about a full reconciliation of all parties. Mussulmans can no longer afford to fight each other as of old ; and I know that a reunion of the sects is already an idea with advanced thinkers. Lastly, the Caliphate would in Arabia be freed from the incubus of Turkish scholasticism and the stigma of Turkish immorality, and would have freer scope for what Islam most of all requires, a moral reformation.

It is surely not beyond the flight of sane imagination to suppose, in the last overwhelming catastrophe of Constantinople, a council of Ulema assembling at Mecca, and according to the legal precedent of ancient days electing a Caliph. The assembly would, without doubt, witness intrigues of princes and quarrels among schoolmen and appeals to fanaticism and accusations of infidelity. Money, too, would certainly play its part there as elsewhere, and perhaps blood might be shed. But any one who remembers the history of the Christian Church in the fifteenth century, and the synods which preceded the Council of Basle, must admit that such accompaniments of intrigue and corruption are no bar to a legal solution of religious difficulties. It was above all else the rivalries of Popes and Anti-popes that precipitated the Catholic Reformation.

But I reserve this portion of my argument for another paper.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

(To be continued.)

ITALIAN REALISTIC FICTION.

OF all contemporary continental literatures, the Italian is probably the least known to English readers. The language is very little cultivated among us in comparison with French and German. Nor is it pretended that the modern literature of Italy offers anything like so rich a field, either for the purposes of instruction or amusement, as the two former. But still there is a great deal which would repay examination; and the list of meritorious works in a great variety of departments is daily extending. One reason why a book of genius in Italy often fails to make its mark so immediately as would be the case in other countries is the still imperfect unification of the kingdom. The Italian provinces have by no means learned to look on Rome as the centre of Art and Letters. A Milanese desires first of all reputation among his fellow Lombards; a Turinese in Piedmont; a Palermitan in Sicily. That centripetal force which impels the French or English provincial in search of fame towards Paris or London is as yet undeveloped in the Italian social system. This localisation of the reputations of authors sometimes tends to give a certain narrow and provincial tone to their works. The sense of proportion—of the relation of parts to the whole—is apt to be lost when a writer, instead of measuring himself against the picked intellects of his nation, measures himself only against the picked intellects of his province or his parish. Still, every now and then a book appears which, by the force of singular merit, attracts the attention of the best judges in all parts of Italy. Such a book may not be immediately received with a general chorus of praise. But once launched, its progress is sure, although possibly slow.

The works of Signor Giovanni Verga, which are attracting remarkable attention throughout Italy, profess to be studies of nature and fact. But the intrinsic differences between them and the modern French realistic novel of M. Zola and his school are very curious and noteworthy,

Signor Giovanni Verga is no novice in fiction. He has written several novels which have been favourably received, but excited no especial remark. Their subjects lay, for the most part, in the fashionable world; and their treatment resembled, in some degree, the manner of the Parisian novel of what I may perhaps be allowed to call the pre-Zolaite period. From time to time, however, Signor Verga published in some periodical a short sketch or story which arrested attention by its power, and by the vivid truth with which it depicted the rural life of Sicily and the character of the Sicilian

peasant. The collection of these sketches, entitled *Vita dei Campi*, contains eight stories in a post octavo volume of some two hundred and fifty pages. Of these short tales two or three are real masterpieces; all bear the impress of talent of a very high order. With one exception—the story called “*Il come, il quando, ed il perchè*”—they deal with the Sicilian peasant and workmen of the lowest and poorest class. There is the half savage herdsman who wanders like a nomad Arab over the wide sultry plains, or among the solitary mountain pastures; the brutalised neglected pariah working in the great subterranean excavations whence is dug the red volcanic sand used throughout Italy for making mortar; the brigand outlaw, hunted like a wild beast over the land; the carter who has four mules in his stable, and is as rich as a crowned king; and a variety of other figures, every one drawn with a strong unfaltering hand. All the tales are sad; several tragic; one or two appallingly so. Such are *La Lupa*, and *Rosso Malpelo*. The former, despite its repulsive subject, fascinates by the power with which a story of crime as terrible as a tragedy of Sophocles is indicated within the compass of a few pages.

In some introductory words preceding the sketch called *L'amante di Gramigna* Verga gives clearly enough his own ideal of fiction.

“I believe,” he writes, “that the triumph of the novel, that most complete and most human of all works of art, will be attained when the affinity and cohesion of every part of it shall be so complete, that the process of its creation remains a mystery like the development of human passions; when the harmony of its form shall be so perfect, the sincerity of its realism so obvious, its nature and origin so evidently necessary, that the hand of the artist becomes absolutely invisible; when the narrative shall bear the stamp of a real event, and the work of art shall seem to have *made itself*, to have grown and ripened spontaneously like a natural fact, without preserving any point of contact with its author; when its living form shall reveal no trace of the mind which conceived it, of the eye which perceived it, of the lips which murmured its first words like the creative *fiat*; when it shall stand forth as its own reason for being, by the mere fact that it is, as it necessarily must be, palpitating with life, and immutable as a bronze statue whose maker has had the divine courage to eclipse himself, and disappear in his own immortal work.”

In an examination of the *Vita dei Campi* and *I Malavoglia*, it is necessary to draw attention to their linguistic form. The literary use of the Italian language is peculiarly cabined, cribbed, confined by pedantic rules and academic traditions. The written and the spoken tongue differ from each other infinitely more than is the case with us, or even in France. And this circumstance adds a difficulty to the task of the naturalistic, as opposed to the romantic, writer which can hardly be estimated by a foreigner. One of Verga's most competent Italian critics writes on this subject:—

“There is also the novelty of the form which Verga has felt himself obliged to adopt, in order that the difficult medium of this terrible Italian language,

most absolute transparency which the art of words admits of, the minutest details of his Sicilian subject. With happy artistic intuition, Verga has fused which hampers us all, might be made to render with the utmost limpidity, the together the vulgar tongue and the insular dialect in one mould extraordinarily elaborated; just as M. Zola proposed to do with the French language and the slang of Paris in his *Assommoir*."

On this point the verdict of the critic quoted above (Signor Luigi Capuana) has an authority which no foreigner can pretend to. But so far as our judgment goes we can heartily concur in it. Indeed, a very moderate acquaintance with Italian life and literature might suffice to make it evident that the use of a highly polished Della Cruscan phraseology in such subjects as those of the *Vita dei Campi*, would produce an intolerable artistic dissonance between the manner and the matter. And the mastery with which Giovanni Verga handles what Signor Capuana calls *il difficile strumento di questa diabolica lingua Italiana*, is not the least striking manifestation of his genius.

Rosso Malpelo, the story of a boy who works in the sand-mines of Sicily, is a study of remarkable power from the force of imaginative insight which has been able to pierce the darkness of an utterly neglected and ignorant human soul. The author's tenderness—a quality which perhaps not every reader would at first sight attribute to him—is peculiarly manifested in this story. Verga gives you details of cruelty, brutality, and suffering with what seems pitiless veracity. He chronicles; he makes no comment. He stands aside and silently presents his picture. But the picture could only have been painted by one whose sympathy with suffering was intense. His vivid sense of the misery and ill-treatment of dumb beasts is remarkable, and is indicated in many of his sketches. His sympathy takes an almost savage tone. "Look here!" he seems to say. "These things happen. They are true. You shall see them. I will spare you none of them." But it is impossible to doubt that he himself has commiserated them with painful acuteness.

Rosso Malpelo is a nickname given to its bearer by his fellow-workmen, and used by everybody until "his own mother had almost forgotten his Christian name." The words signify, literally, Red Evil-hair. "He was called so because he had red hair; and he had red hair because he was a bad, ill-disposed boy, who promised to turn out a thorough rascal." These opening sentences give the key-note of the whole study. The boy's wickedness, as manifested by his red hair and his rough, sullen aspect, is taken for granted by every one, including Malpelo himself. He is always ragged and dirty, because his mother and sister neglect him. The former only sees him once a week, on Saturdays, when he brings her his few pence of wages—which are received with suspicion, for Red-head, being such a bad boy, probably keeps back a soldo or two. In the

doubt, he regularly gets a cuffing, by way of receipt, although the master of the mine confirms Malpelo's statement that the sum is so much and no more. The lad is kicked, buffeted, sworn at, "put upon worse than the grey donkey," but he never complains. His character is so subtly indicated that it is difficult to analyse the touches which convey it to the reader. But the impression is clearly given. He is strong, fierce, and fearless, with latent heroisms in his dark young soul. And there is a strain of tenderness, running like a golden thread through a nature made coarse and brutal by injustice. The pathos of the wasted possibilities in the lonely, neglected boy is heart-breaking.

Malpelo, although in fact he works indefatigably, is popularly said to be kept at the mine "out of charity," because his father, Mastro Misciu, died there. Mastro Misciu was a good, industrious, in-offensive fellow, who quarrelled with no one. He kept his strength for the blows of his pickaxe in the red volcanic sand, instead of fighting his fellow-workmen, who consequently despised him. They gave him the nickname of Bestia, or the Beast, because he was the beast of burthen of the whole mine. For his part, he let them jeer, and went on earning his bread. But Malpelo, small as he was, took all the wrongs of his father to heart, "as though they had fallen on his own shoulders." And he had certain glances with his eyes, which made the miners say, "Aha, my lad, *you'll* never die in your bed like your father!" But his father did not die in his bed after all, good Beast though he was. And this is how it happened. *Mastro Misciu* had undertaken a job on his own account, by contract with the master of the mine. He was to dig away a pillar of the sandy earth which had been left to support the roof of the mine, but was now supposed to be no longer needed. The other workmen said Misciu had made a bad bargain, and, moreover, that to remove the pillar would be a very dangerous job. "But, as to that, everything is dangerous in the mine. And if you stop to look at danger, you had better go and make yourself a lawyer." So Misciu worked on at his pillar one Saturday evening when all the other workmen had gone home. The description of what follows is so powerful in its uncompromising simplicity, that we are tempted to give it in as literal a rendering as possible of the author's own words.

"So on the Saturday evening, Mastro Misciu was still scraping away at his pillar a good while after the *Ave Maria* had rung, and after his comrades had lighted their pipes and gone off, advising him to sit still with his hands in his pockets, for love of the master; and warning him not to make the end of a rat in a trap. But he, being used to their chaff, took no heed of it, and only answered with his 'Ugh! ugh!' at every hearty stroke of the pickaxe. And between whiles he kept muttering, 'This is for the bread! This is for the wine! This is for Nunziata's new petticoat!' And so he went on reckoning up how he should spend the profits of his grand contract.

"Outside the cave the sky was all twinkling with stars, and down below

there the lantern was smoking, and turning like a spindle. And the great red pillar, disembowelled by the pick, twisted and bent as if it suffered and cried out oh! oh! Malpelo was clearing away the rubbish, and putting up the big pickaxe, the empty sack, and the wine-flask. His father, who was fond of him, poor fellow, kept saying 'Stand back!' or else 'Look out! look out for falling pebbles or coarse sand from overhead!' All of a sudden he left off speaking, and Malpelo, who had turned round to put the tools in the basket, heard a dull suffocated kind of noise, such as sand makes when it pours down in a heap, and the light went out.

"That evening when they went in haste to look for the chief engineer who directed the works of the mine, he was at the theatre; and he wouldn't have exchanged his stall for the throne, being a great playgoer. Rossi was acting *Hamlet*, and there was a splendid house. At the door the engineer found himself in a crowd of women belonging to Monserrato, who were screeching and beating their breasts to announce the great misfortune that had befallen *Comare Santa*. She, poor thing, was the only one who said nothing; and her teeth chattered as if it had been January. When they told the engineer that the thing had happened nearly four hours ago, he asked what was the use of coming to him after four hours. Nevertheless he went off with ladders and torches. But two more hours passed, making six since the accident; and a lame old workman said that to clear away the stuff that had fallen they would take a good week.

"Talk of forty loads of sand! Why there had fallen a mountain of sand, all fine and well burnt by the lava, so that you might beat it up with your hands, and it would take no end of time to turn it into mortar! There was enough to load the carts for weeks and weeks. A fine bargain *Mastro Bestia* had made of it!

"The engineer went back to see Ophelia buried, and the miners shrugged their shoulders and went home, one after the other. In the press and confusion no one had heeded a child's voice that had lost all human tone, and kept shrieking, 'Dig, dig here! Quick!' 'Holloa!' said the lame workman. 'Why, it's Malpelo! Where has Malpelo cropped up from? If you hadn't been Malpelo, you wouldn't have got off scot free, that you wouldn't!' The others began to laugh; and one said that Malpelo had the devil on his side, and another that he had as many lives as a cat. Malpelo answered no word. He didn't even cry. He had been digging with his nails in the sand right in a hole, so that no one had perceived him. And when they came near with a light, they found him with his face distorted, and his eyes like glass, and foaming at the mouth, enough to terrify one. His nails were torn, and his hands covered with blood. But when they tried to take him away, it was a terrible business. Not being able to scratch, he bit, like a mad dog; and they had to take him by the hair and drag him away by main force.

"However he came back again to the mine after a few days. His mother came whimpering and leading him by the hand; for you have to earn your bread where you can. In fact Malpelo would never go far from that gallery. (Where the accident had happened.) And he dug furiously, as if he were lifting every bucket of sand off his father's breast. Sometimes when he was at work, he would stop suddenly with his pick raised, a fierce look on his face, and his eyes staring, as if he were listening to something that the devil whispered in his ear from the other side of the mountain of fallen sand. On those days he was more wicked and gloomy than usual; so much so that he hardly ate anything, but would throw his bread to the dog, as if it had not been a good gift of God. The dog loved him, because a dog does not look at anything but the hand that feeds him. But the grey donkey, poor crook-legged, raw-boned beast, had to endure all the outpourings of Malpelo's wickedness. He beat it mercilessly with the handle of the pickaxe, muttering, 'It'll make you die all the sooner!'"

After a time there comes to labour in the mine a poor lad whose

hip has been dislocated by a fall from some scaffolding, and who can no longer work at his calling of a bricklayers' labourer. He drags himself along with his dislocated hip in such a queer, awkward, sprawling fashion that the miners gave him the nickname of *Ranocchio*, or the "Frog." However, frog as he is, he manages to earn his bread in the mine by carrying sand.

"By a refinement of malignity, Malpelo seemed to have taken this boy under his protection. He even shared his bread with him sometimes, in order to enjoy the pleasure of tyrannising over him, as they said. He would beat his protégé for no cause at all, and without pity. And if Ranocchio did not defend himself, he would hit the harder, crying out 'Take that, you soft fool! If you haven't the pluck to stand up against me, that mean you no harm, you'll let any one trample on you that likes!' Whenever Ranocchio had a job too hard for his strength, and began to snivel like a girl, Malpelo would give him a thump on the back and bid him hold his tongue for a milk-sop. But if Ranocchio went on lamenting, Malpelo would lend him a hand, saying with a certain pride 'Here, let me do it! I'm stronger than you.' Or he would give Ranocchio his half onion, and content himself with dry bread. 'I'm used to it,' he would say, shrugging his shoulders."

In truth, he is used to everything—to buffets, to kicks, to blows with the handle of the mattock, or the straps of the pack-saddle; to abuse and jeers from everybody, and to sleeping on a heap of stones with his arms and back aching after fourteen hours' work. Whatever goes wrong in the mine is said to be his fault. Accused justly or unjustly, he never defends himself. Sometimes Ranocchio, terrified and trembling at the brutal punishment his friend receives for a fault he has not committed, implores him with tears to speak and exculpate himself. But Malpelo utters no word. "What's the use?" says he. "I'm *Malpelo*." He has formed some theories of life for himself, which he communicates laconically to Ranocchio "The ass," he tells him, "is beaten because he can't beat again. If he could, he would trample us all under his hoof and tear us with his teeth." And again: "The sand is treacherous. It's like all the others. If you're the weakest they kick you in the face, but if you're the stronger, or many of you together, then you get the best of it. My father was always picking and hitting at the sand. He never hit anything else, though, and that's why they call him *Bestia*. And the sand swallowed him up one day by a dirty trick, because it was stronger than he was."

He tells Ranocchio, moreover, that when once they shall have finished clearing out all the sand from a certain spot they will come upon his father's body; and that "his father had on a pair of fustian trousers nearly new." Ranocchio is frightened at the idea of finding the corpse under all that sand. But Malpelo is not frightened. He relates how he had been used to the mine from a little child, and describes how it stretches out in a labyrinth of intricate galleries, far, far away, even to the desolate sea-shore; and how men have been lost there, and wandered for years in the

desolate darkness, shouting for help, and no human ear but their own could hear their cries. Ranocchio's conversation is of a less gloomy nature. He loves to look up at the stars twinkling above the aperture of the mine, and to tell how that Paradise is up there, "where the dead people go when they have been good, and not vexed their parents."

"Who told you so?" asked Malpelo. And Ranocchio answered that his mother had told him so. Then Malpelo, scratching his head and smiling, replied with the air of a cute fellow who wasn't to be taken in, 'Your mother made you believe that, because you're more fit to wear petticoats than breeches.' And then having thought the matter over for a while, he added, "My father was good, and did harm to nobody, so much so that they called him *Bestia*. But yet he's down below there, and they found even his tools, and his shoes, and these trousers I've got on!"

For the body of poor Mastro Misciu has been found, preserved by the dry, fine sand as though it had been embalmed. One day a workman filling his bucket with sand comes on a shoe of Mastro Misciu, and Malpelo is seized with such a fit of trembling that they are obliged to hoist him up by ropes into the open air, "like a dead donkey;" and from that moment, so great is his horror of suddenly seeing his father's naked foot sticking out from the sand, that nothing will induce him to work any more in that part of the mine. But they take off Misciu's shirt, and "the fustian trousers nearly new," and the widow cuts them down for Malpelo. As it is impossible to cut the shoes down, they are put aside to wait until the boy shall be big enough to wear them.

"Malpelo smoothed them down on his legs, those fustian trousers nearly new. He thought they felt soft and smooth like the touch of his father's hands, when he used to stroke his hair, rough and red as it was. The shoes he kept hung on a nail above the sacking he slept on; and on Sundays he would take them in his hands, and clean them, and try them on. Then he would set them on the floor side by side, and sit and stare at them, with his elbows on his knees and his chin in his hands, for hours together, turning over who knows what notions in that good-for-nothing head of his! For he had very queer notions, had Malpelo. As he had inherited his father's mattock and pickaxe as well as his clothes, he would use them, although they were too heavy for his years. And when he was asked if he would sell them, and was offered the same price as if they had been new, he answered, 'No; his father had made their handles so smooth and shining with his hands, and he himself could never make any other tools smoother and shinier than those, not if he worked with them for a hundred years.'"

Presently Ranocchio droops and sickens in the subterranean atmosphere of the mine. He has never been strong, and becomes rapidly worse. He has fever and spitting of blood, and at length is carried away to his home, trembling with fever like a half-drowned hen. Then Malpelo steals a few pence from his own pay to buy wine and hot broth for Ranocchio, and he gives him his fustian trousers nearly new to keep him warm; but nothing will do that when the shiver of the fever takes hold of him; not covering him with sacking or straw, nor even putting him close before a fire. From

time to time he returns to his work, but always suffering, coughing, shivering, consumed by fever and consumption. When he lies before a blazing fire in the mine, groaning feebly, and staring upwards with fixed, glassy eyes, Malpelo will sit bending over him and watching him. And when Ranocchio is at the worst Malpelo is reminded of the grey donkey that used to pant and stumble under his heavy load, and he mutters, "It would be better for you to die quick. If you are to suffer like that, it would be better for you to die quick!" And the master of the mine observes that Malpelo—the wicked, perverse, red-haired Malpelo—is capable of giving the boy a knock on the head, and that it would be well to watch him.

At length Ranocchio is unable to return to his work any more. Malpelo goes to see him in his own dwelling on the Saturday holiday afternoon, and finds Ranocchio's mother crying and lamenting over her son, "as though he had been one of those who can earn ten francs a week." This altogether passes Malpelo's comprehension, and he asks Ranocchio why his mother makes such a fuss about his mortal sickness, when for the last two months he hasn't earned as much as would pay for his food.

Ranocchio dies. Malpelo's mother marries again and goes away. His sister is also married, and the red-haired Pariah is abandoned utterly to his fate. There is not a soul to take any heed of what happens to him. He is charged with the most unpleasant, laborious, and dangerous tasks. He shows no care for himself, and no one shows any for him. One day it is resolved to explore a passage which is supposed to communicate with a great shaft of the mine towards the valley. If the thing should turn out to be so, much time and labour would be saved by it. But if it should turn out not to be so, why then there would be some danger of the explorer losing himself, and never finding his way back. So that no father of a family would undertake the job, nor allow any of his flesh and blood to undertake it either, for all the gold in the world. Of course, Malpelo is pitched upon for the enterprise. There is no one to refuse for him.

"When they sent him on the exploration, he remembered the miner who was lost years and years ago, and who still wanders in the darkness calling for help, with no one to hear him. But he said nothing. What would have been the use? He took his father's tools, the mattock, the pick, the lantern, the bag of bread, and the flask of wine, and set off. And nothing more was ever heard of him.

"So even the bones of Malpelo were lost. And the boys who work at the excavations drop their voices when they talk about him down in the mine; for they are almost afraid to see him suddenly appear before them, with his red hair and his fierce grey eyes."

Jeli il Pastore is another study of a lonely ignorant lad, but different in every respect from Malpelo.

Jeli's days are passed in the open air, on the plains or in the highlands, winter and summer. He is alone for the most part of his life with nature. He has for weeks and weeks no other companions

than the horses he tends. He is a herd-boy, and leads the mares and foals to pasture, and watches them, and brings them back to their shelter in the evening. His mother is in service far away, and he only sees her once a year, when he goes with the young colts to the fair of San Giovanni. His father is a cowherd out beyond Licodia, "where you might mow the malaria with a scythe," as the peasants of the neighbourhood describe it. But wherever there is malaria the pastures are fat, and the cows don't take the fever. Lonely enough is little Jeli, who began to be a herd-boy when he was so small that you could hardly see him among the tails of his horses; but he is not unhappy. Compared with Malpelo's, his life is a dream of paradise.

"Ah, what fine rides across the newly-reaped fields with manes flying in the wind! What fair April days when the breeze heaped up the green grass into waves, and the mares were neighing in the pastures! What splendid summer noons when the country lay whitening under the dark blue sky, and the grasshoppers were *crackling* among the dry sods, as though the stubble were on fire! And then the clear winter skies seen through the bare branches of the almond trees that shivered in the north wind, the frozen road sounding under the horse's hoofs, and the larks trilling up aloft in the warm blue! The lovely summer evenings coming down softly like a mist; the good smell of the hay where you sank down elbow-deep; the melancholy hum of the insects; and those two notes of Jeli's pipe always the same,—*te-ru! te-ru! te-ru!* They made one think of things far away, of the feast of San Giovanni, of Christmas Night, of the bells ringing at dawn—of all those past events which seem sorrowful seen from so far off, and make one look upward with moist eyes as if all the stars coming out in the sky were rained down into one's heart and made it overflow."

Jeli is not unhappy. He makes friends with the *Signorino*, a certain little Don Alfonso, the son of some gentlefolks who come to make their villeggiatura in his neighbourhood. The young gentleman pays a daily visit to Jeli, who teaches him to climb after magpies' nests up to the very top of walnut-trees higher than the bell-tower of Licodia; to hit a sparrow flying with a stone; and to vault at one bound on to the bare back of one of his half-savage beasts, seizing the first that passed by the mane, undismayed by the angry neighing of the unbroken colts and their desperate leaps. On his side Alfonso displays his proficiency in the mysterious arts of reading and writing, which excite the profoundest wonder and admiration in his humble friend. Not that Jeli shows anything of this feeling. He remains outwardly impassive, "with that mask of oriental indifference which is the dignity of the Sicilian peasant." He is suspicious, too. Having induced Don Alfonso to write a name for him on a scrap of paper, he carries it to the field overseer, and to Fra Cola, the monk, to satisfy himself by their testimony that the characters on the paper really do, in some miraculous fashion, represent the sound. The name written is *Mara*. And some time afterwards Jeli informs his friend Alfonso that he has a sweetheart! It is now Alfonso's turn to open his eyes, in spite of all his learning.

But Jeli is quite grave and serious. The lady, it appears, is Mara, the daughter of Massaro Agrippino, the farmer. They have cuffed each other and played together, and Jeli intends to marry her when he shall be grown up, and shall have six *ounces* of wages. But little Mara as yet knows nothing of the fate in store for her.

Jeli's father, the cowherd, dies of malarious fever. The boy nurses him with the utmost tenderness, as far as his poor means allow. When the sick man dies, Jeli is absolutely alone in the world, for his mother has died some years previously. There is a pathetically told incident of the death of a colt, killed by falling into a ravine. This accident, for which the herdsman is held responsible, causes Jeli to lose his place. But with the help of Mara's father he gets another employment as shepherd. And being honest, laborious, and apt to learn, he makes his way in the world.

Meanwhile, Mara grows up to be very pretty and coquettish. She becomes engaged to the son of a rich farmer, but the match is broken off on account of some scandalous rumours respecting her and Don Alfonso, the young gentleman who had been Jeli's childish friend and patron. One day Mara goes to see Jeli, who is busy with his dairy operations (for the making of cheese from the ewes' milk is part of his business), and there ensues a short dialogue which is a marvel of skill in its bare simplicity. When Jeli asks her why the match with the rich farmer's son did not come off, she answers that her father has been unfortunate and had losses; the beans, and the wheat, and the vineyard have gone wrong. Her brother is drawn for the conscription, and the bay mule has died that was worth forty ounces.

"Now that we have had losses, who do you think will marry me?"

"Mara was breaking to pieces a twig of hedge-briar, with her chin on her breast, and her eyes cast down: and every now and then her elbow joggled Jeli's elbow without her heeding it. But Jeli, with his eyes fixed on the churn, made no answer. She went on. 'At Tebidi they used to say you and I would be man and wife. Do you remember?' 'Yes,' said Jeli, and laid down the churn-staff. 'But I'm a poor shepherd, and I can't look to get the daughter of a farmer like you.' Mara remained silent for a little while, and then said, 'If you like to take me, for my part I'll have you willingly.'"

"Really and truly?"

"Yes; really and truly?"

"And what would Master Agrippina say?"

"My father says that you know your business, and that you're not one of those who spend all their earnings, but that you make a penny go as far as two. And you don't eat up what you have; and so you'll come to have sheep of your own some day, and be rich."

"If that's it," said Jeli, "I would have you as willingly as you would have me."

"Here!" said Mara, when it had grown dusk, and the sheep were falling silent one by one, "if you'd like a kiss, I don't mind giving you one now, because we are to be man and wife."

"Jeli took his kiss very quietly. And not knowing very well what to say, he added, 'I've always loved you, even when you were going to throw me over for Farmer Neri's son.' But he had not the heart to hint to her about that other."

" 'Well, there, you see! We were destined for each other!' said Mara in conclusion."

So the marriage is made, and Jeli is as happy as a king. He watches Mara moving about their poor little house and wonders that she should have chosen him, when she might have had almost any one she liked, so handsome and graceful as she is! Meanwhile, the neighbours sneer and jeer. They know all about the story of Don Alfonso, and the true reason why the match with the farmer's son was broken off. And as to Jeli—no doubt he knows it too; only he finds it convenient to shut his eyes and be prosperous in his shame. Why should they say anything to Jeli about the matter? But the fact is that Jeli knows nothing. He believes in his Mara. He adores her in his silent, simple way. And when he comes home twice a month from the sheep pastures he always finds her kind and gentle, looking so neat and tranquil and pretty, with her fresh pink cheeks and her big black eyes, that Jeli, in his humble home, does not envy the Pope himself.

But one day a shepherd boy whom he has been reproving for pilfering in his passion lets out the common scandal in the coarsest and plainest terms, and throws Jeli's shame in his teeth. The other men present fully expect to see bloodshed. But Jeli remains stark still like one stunned, and answers nothing. But the next time he sees Mara he turns pale and looks at her strangely from head to foot, as if he had never set eyes on her before, or as if, in his absence, they had changed his Mara for another woman.

"It seemed as if he scarcely dared to raise his eyes to hers as she moved about setting the table and preparing the soup, neat and tranquil as usual. At length, after pondering for a long time, he asked her, 'Is it true that you have an understanding with Don Alfonso?' Mara fixed her big black eyes on her husband and made the sign of the cross. 'Why do you want to make me commit a sin to-day of all days?' she cried" (for Mara had just come home from making her Easter confession). "'I didn't believe it,' said Jeli, 'because when we were boys, Don Alfonso and I, we were always together. He used to come every day to Tebidi when I was there. And then he's rich; he has shovelfuls of money. If he wanted any woman he might marry whom he pleased, and never know what want means.'"

In a word, Jeli cannot believe in her treachery, nor understand what jealousy means. Every new idea had considerable difficulty in making its way into his brain. And this idea was so monstrous that it was impossible to admit it. His Mara, and Don Alfonso, who had been his friend and playfellow!

One day, at the sheep-shearing time, Don Alfonso and a party of his friends arrive at the farmhouse where Jeli and his men are busy. And they order a great feast to be prepared—kids, and sheep, and fowls, and turkeys. And whilst the dinner is being cooked the gentlefolks sit under the shade of the carob trees, or dance to the sound of the tambourine and bagpipe with the peasant women and girls. Mara, too, is there in all her holiday finery. Jeli has never

chanced to see Don Alfonso since childhood until that day. But Alfonso recognises his old playfellow and salutes him with a friendly slap on the shoulder. When Jeli sees the young man so grown and altered, with a curly beard to match his curly hair, and his velvet jacket, and a gold watch-chain on his waistcoat, he has a strange burning sensation in his heart. As he goes on shearing his sheep with the great shears his knees tremble under him, and it seems to him as though the wool under his hands and the meadows where the young sheep are playing were all reeking with blood. All at once Don Alfonso calls Mara to come and dance with the others.

“ ‘Don’t go!’ said Jeli. ‘Don’t go, Mara!’ ”

“ ‘Why not?’ ”

“ ‘I won’t have you go. Don’t go!’ ”

“ ‘You hear, they’re calling me.’ ”

“ He uttered no further intelligible word as he bent over the sheep he was shearing. Mara shrugged her shoulders and went off to dance. She was rosy and gay, with her black eyes as bright as stars, her white teeth all showing when she laughed, and the gold ornaments quivering and glittering against her cheeks and on her bosom, till she looked like the very Madonna herself. Jeli had raised himself up straight, with the long shears in his hand. He was white in the face—as white as his father the cowherd when he lay trembling with fever in front of the fire in their hut. All at once when he saw Don Alfonso with his curly beard, and his velvet jacket, and his gold watch-chain, take Mara by the hand to dance, only that very moment when he saw him touch her, Jeli rushed upon him and cut his throat at one stroke as though he had been a kid.

“ Later, when they were taking him before the judge, bound and helpless, and utterly unresisting, he said, ‘What—I wasn’t even to kill him? And he had taken away my Mara!’ ”

In *I Malavoglia*, the history of a poor fisherman’s family in an obscure sea-coast townlet of Sicily, Verga’s genius has taken a longer and stronger flight than any it had previously attempted. And good critics will recognise that in this book he has proved himself to possess powers of the very highest kind. Like all writers of native force, Verga has his own manner, his own turn of phrase, his own tone of colouring. The language throughout is, as has been explained, purposely simple. The force of the epithets is proportioned, with almost unerring artistic instinct, to the importance of the matter described. What a painter would call the “values” of the picture are admirably adjusted. But there is, moreover, in this story a power of genuine pathos which, so far as we know, has seldom been reached, and perhaps never surpassed, in fiction. And Verga is a thoroughly national writer. He is not an imitator of the English school or of the French school. He affects the style neither of Dickens nor Hugo, of Thackeray nor Zola. His works are not artificial flowers of wax or muslin, but genuine growths with their root in Italian soil. His reality is not merely the reality of the cesspool and the sewer, but has plenty of oxygen in it. The Nasty is, no doubt, real; but it is not the sole reality. And Verga has not that constitutional ten-

dency to overlook all realities, save the Nasty, which, unfortunately, mars the work of some powerful French writers. Amidst all the talk about, and admiration for, the naturalistic school, it is sometimes forgotten that the mere quality of repulsiveness does not, in itself, constitute a valid claim on our attention; and, moreover, that we are no more secure from exaggeration in depicting the loathsome than the lovely.

In the preface to *I Malavoglia* the author states that his aim has been to make "a sincere and dispassionate study of the mode in which the first disquieting desire to better their condition probably arises among people of the humblest class; and of what perturbation must be caused in a family who have hitherto lived comparatively happily, by the vague longing for the unknown, and the discovery that they are badly off—or at least that they might be better off. The motive force of human activity which produces the torrent of progress is here seized at its source, in its most modest and material aspect. The mechanism of the passions in these low spheres is less complicated, and can therefore be observed with more precision."

Signor Verga announces his intention of following up *I Malavoglia* by a series of studies in which the same tendencies will be traced throughout a variety of social spheres gradually rising to the highest ranks of aristocracy and wealth. In his preface, Verga writes like a philosophical sociologist; but in his story he happily writes like an artist. The persual of the preface might possibly repel a reader who believes that Art forfeits some of her highest privileges by invading the province of Science. But let him not be discouraged. Verga's work is, as all imaginative works should be, "its own excuse for being."

The hero of the story is, without doubt, old Padron 'Ntoni, the head of a family of fisher-folks dwelling at Aci-Trezza, on the eastern coast of Sicily. They live in patriarchal fashion in a house of their own, which is known as the Casa del Nespolo, or House of the Medlar-tree. The real name of the family, as inscribed on the parish register, is Toscano. But that is no matter; for they have always been known as Malavoglia since the beginning of the world, at Ognina, at Trezza, and at Aci-Castello. They have been good brave seamen from father to son—quite the contrary of their nickname (*Malavoglia*, i.e. ill-will, malevolence)—and have their fishing bark *la Provvidenza*.

"Padron 'Ntoni used to say, showing his clenched fist, that looked as if it were made of walnut-wood, 'To pull an oar, all five fingers must help one another.' And again: 'Men are made like the fingers of your hand; the thumb must behave like a thumb, and the little finger like a little finger.' And the family of Padron 'Ntoni was really all ranged in order like the fingers of your hand. First came he himself, the thumb, that ruled over everything; then his son Bastiano, called *Bastianazzo*, because he was as tall and big as the St. Christopher painted up on the arch of the fish-market in the city. But for as

tall and as big as he was, he obeyed the word of command straight and sharp; and he wouldn't have blown his nose if his father hadn't said he might blow it. So much so, that he married *la Longa* directly he was told to take her. The next was *la Longa*, a little bit of a woman, who wove, and salted the anchovies, and bore children, like a good housewife. Lastly came the grandchildren according to their ages: 'Ntoni the eldest, a great lout of twenty, who was constantly getting a box on the ear from his grandfather, and a kick a little lower down, to restore his equilibrium if the cuff had been too strong; Luca, who had more sense than his big brother, and was like the grandfather; Mena (*Filomena*), surnamed Sant 'Agata, because she was always at her loom, and the saying goes 'A woman at the loom, a hen in the poultry-yard, and a mullet in January'; 'Alessi (*Alessio*) an old-fashioned urchin just his grandfather over again; and Lia (*Rosalia*) who was neither fish nor flesh as yet. On Sundays when they marched into church one behind the other, they looked like a procession.

"Padron 'Ntoni, too, had certain *mottoes* and proverbs which he had heard from the old folks before him, such as: 'The saying of the old ones never lied; 'Without a pilot the boat won't go; 'If you want to be Pope, you must know how to be Sacristan; 'Follow the trade you know, and if you don't grow rich you won't starve; 'Content yourself with what your father has done for you, and at least you will never be a rogue; and other judicious sentences. And there you have the reason why the House of the Medlar-tree prospered. Padron 'Ntoni passed for such a long-headed fellow, that at Trezza they would have made him one of the communal counsellors; only Don Silvestro the secretary, who knew all about politics, kept preaching that Padron 'Ntoni was a rank Tory, a reactionary who sided with the Bourbons, and conspired for the return of *Franceschello* (the ex-king of the Two Sicilies Francis II.) 'in order to hector about in the village the same as he did in his own house. But the truth was Padron 'Ntoni did not even know *Franceschello* by sight, and he minded his own business, and was used to say 'Ho who has the charge of a household can't sleep when he would,' because 'the skipper has to give a reckoning.'"

Such is the family of the Malavoglia, so called in accordance with the universal Sicilian custom of giving nicknames which are inherited from father to son, long after the original quality or defect which called them forth has ceased to exist.

'Ntoni, the eldest of Bastianazzo's three sons, is taken for the naval conscription, and the loss of his strong young arm is felt in the fishing bark. Still the sagacious old grandfather consoles himself and the others for 'Ntoni's absence, by observing that a little discipline will do the lad no harm, seeing that he likes better to lounge with his arms folded on Sundays, than to use them to earn a living; and that when he has tasted other people's salt bread, he won't grumble any more over the soup he gets at home. Meanwhile Mena has entered her seventeenth year, and they must think of marrying her. 'Ntoni is away and there is a bread-winner the less. So the grandfather resolves to make a speculation, which turns out to be the first in a chain of misfortunes that finally ruin the family. He makes a bargain for a cargo of lupins to be carried in his boat to a little port called Riposto, and sold to a Trieste ship which is taking in freight there. Padron 'Ntoni gets the lupins on credit. If the affair turns out well, there will be bread for the whole winter, and earrings for Mena, and

her dowry ready to be paid down. "If the affair turns out well." But the fate of the family hangs on the "if."

To begin with, the simple fisherman is cheated by an avaricious old usurer of the village, who sells him the lupins on credit. This man—a type of rustic greed, cunning, and stolidity—is called *lo Zio Crocifisso* (Uncle Crucifix: this singular Christian name and others still more singular being not at all uncommon in Italy), sur-named *Campana di Legno*, or Wooden Bell, because to appeal to his mercy, generosity, or forbearance, is like pulling a wooden bell with a wooden clapper: there is no response! Zio Crocifisso sells Padron 'Ntoni a boat-load of damaged lupins. They are to be paid for at Christmas; and profit or no profit, Campana di Legno will have his bond. But that is not the worst. Bastianazzo has put out to sea on a fine evening with his cargo of lupins, and only one other seaman, a young fellow named Menico (Domenico), son of a poor widowed sister of Zio Crocifisso. At midnight the wind changes. One of the sudden September storms so common in the Mediterranean sweeps over the sea, and bark and men are lost. Poor Maruzza (*la Longa*) is left a widow with her orphan family.

Now begins the slow, deadly, struggle with debt and poverty. Campana di Legno is blind and deaf to all save his own interest. The unfortunate *Provvidenza* is fished up out of the sea in an almost helpless condition. But they manage to patch her up so that she may venture to sea in fair weather, and serve yet awhile for the in-shore fishery. Of the two men, Bastianazzo Malavoglia and Menico, no trace is ever found. 'Ntoni the younger has now served his time in the navy, and is allowed to return home. Don Silvestro, the Communal Secretary, says that if 'Ntoni would volunteer for another six-months' service, he might thus free his second brother, Luca, from the conscription. But 'Ntoni will not remain six months nor six hours longer than he is compelled to do.

"As for me," observed Luca, "I'm more than willing to go and serve instead of 'Ntoni, because when he comes back you can launch the *Provvidenza*, and there'll be no need for extra help." "This one is a real Malavoglia to the marrow of his bones!" cried Padron 'Ntoni, beaming with pleasure. "Just the moral of his father Bastianazzo, who had a heart as big as the sea and as good as God's mercy."

So 'Ntoni comes back to Trezza with his navy cap and his blue shirt with the star of Italy on its collar. At first it is all very fine. He arrives on a holiday, and all the pretty girls in their festal finery look on him with favour, and his friends receive him enthusiastically, and he amuses himself mightily. But next day he has to get up before dawn; for Padron 'Ntoni has obtained employment for himself and his grandson aboard Compare Cipolla's fishing smack, with good pay. When they can get the *Provvidenza* ready they will work on their own account, and have no need to take wages from a master. Young 'Ntoni grumbles and yawns when his grandfather comes to

rouse him two hours before dawn; and says it is as bad as when they used to sound the *réveillée* between decks aboard the man-of-war. It wasn't worth while coming home for this! But Alessi, the youngest boy, bids him hold his peace, for "Grandfather is there in the yard busy with the oars and nets; and he was up an hour before we were!"

So it is in everything. 'Ntoni is profoundly selfish, and profoundly discontented. He is always enviously contrasting his own position with that of other folks who are so much better off. His old grandfather, his mother, his brothers, and his sister Mena, toil uncomplainingly from morning till night, refusing no labour however heavy or poorly paid. There is the great mountain of debt weighing on their very souls. And the detailed narration of their struggles to pay the avaricious and pitiless Zio Crocifisso is thoroughly effective. The exorbitant interest he exacts every time the payment of the principal is postponed eats up the poor gains of the family painfully accumulated soldo by soldo. The character of each one of the Malavoglias is delineated with the most subtle discrimination. This is a real artistic *tour de force*, considering the bare simplicity of the means to which Verga rigidly confines himself. There is no word of comment or illustration from beginning to end. Whatever light is thrown on the personages of the story springs from the course of events and their own rustic, untutored utterances, which never rise above the ordinary phrasology of their class. The widowed mother, Maruzza, is an exquisite creation. Her gentleness, deep-hearted affection, and sublime unselfishness are infinitely touching. A tender, silent sympathy unites her and her father-in-law, Padron 'Ntoni. Both simple souls are filled with the love of home and the ideal of duty. They are both heroic in their different fashions—self-sacrificing, laborious, devoted, uncomplaining. Mena, too, and Luca, and Alessi, are all set before us as living realities. But the hero of the book, as we have already stated, is Padron 'Ntoni.

Seafaring folks and sea-going adventures have ever been favourite subjects with our writers, both in prose and verse. They have inspired some of the best work in English literature in a great variety of tones: from Dibdin's *Tom Bowling* to Tennyson's *Ballad of the Fleet*; from Smollett's *Jack Ratlin* to Dickens's *Mr. Peggotty*. We can give no higher praise to Signor Verga's Padron 'Ntoni than to say that he is worthy to be placed among the weather-beaten figures in that immortal gallery. It is very interesting to observe how a certain family likeness runs through all the members of this nautical brotherhood. At first sight it would appear impossible for two human beings to be more different from each other than the British tar and the Sicilian fisherman. Climate, language, manners, traditions, religion—all wide as the poles asunder. But beneath the surface lie some deeper traits which are common to the best specimens of both. The sea appears to inspire a certain reality and sincerity of

character in those whose lives are passed upon it. In their dealings with the great deep, men are inexorably brought face to face with such tremendous facts as call forth their best manhood. One would not be disposed beforehand to expect a high sense of honour—or even much value for common honesty—in an ignorant Sicilian peasant. Yet Padron 'Ntoni is as valiantly true to his ideal of duty as a Sir Philip Sidney. And his ideal of duty includes ceaseless, painful industry to enable him to pay his debt to the man who has cruelly cheated him. The old fisherman's honest instinct perceives what is just, in spite of the encouragement given him by a lawyer whom he employs, to "let Zio Crocifisso do his worst, and ruin himself in law expenses." For the moment, Padron 'Ntoni is intoxicated by the man of law's sanguine view and fluent eloquence, which, although but dimly understood, is exhilarating. But when he gets back to his cottage, and his daughter-in-law interrogates him about the interview, the glamour disappears. His grandson 'Ntoni has been with him to the lawyer, and on their return home the young fellow eagerly announces that Zio Crocifisso may do his worst, for he can't touch the house nor the boat, and that they need not pay him anything.

"But then, the lupins?" said Maruzza.

"Ah, to be sure! The lupins?" repeated Padron 'Ntoni.

"Well, tho lupins!" cried young 'Ntoni. "We haven't eaten his lupins! We haven't got them in our pockets! and Zio Crocifisso can't lay his hands on anything. The lawyer said he would only lose his costs."

"Then followed a short silence. Maruzza did not seem to be convinced.

"Then," said she, "he said we were not to pay?"

"'Ntoni scratched his head, but Padron 'Ntoni exclaimed, 'It's true we had the lupins, and we must pay for them.'

"There was nothing to be said; now that he no longer had the lawyer before him, it was clear they must pay. Padron 'Ntoni kept shaking his head as he muttered, 'No; we won't come to that! None of the Malavoglias have ever acted so. Zio Crocifisso may take the house and the boat and all, but we won't come to that!'

"The poor old man was perplexed. But his daughter-in-law began to cry silently behind her apron."

Piteous are the weary stages by which the family reach final ruin. Their house—the House of the Medlar-tree, which has belonged to the Malavoglias for generations—is seized by Zio Crocifisso for the debt of the lupins. Luca is lost on board the man-of-war, *Re d'Italia*, at the battle of Lissa. A terrible visitation of cholera scourges the country, and Maruzza dies of it. And 'Ntoni goes away from home to seek his fortune! Selfish, restless, and possessed with a vague greed for luxuries—such luxuries as he knows or can conceive of—he refuses to bear his share of the family burthen. He slips his neck out of the yoke beneath which his poor old grandfather, his sister, and his surviving brother are painfully toiling, and goes away. The dream of Padre 'Ntoni has been that Luca would restore the fallen fortunes of the family—Luca, who was "the moral of his father, and a Malavoglia to the marrow of his bones." But the poor lad has

gone down at his post. His body lies at the bottom of the sea like his father's, and that twinkling star of hope is extinguished.

Blow follows upon blow. 'Ntoni returns home ragged and wretched, having failed to find the fortune he went to seek, but bringing back with him more vice and sloth than he carried away. He lounges all day at the village tavern. He forms a disgraceful *liaison* with Santuzza the hostess, and accepts daily food and drink from her, sunk in shameless degradation. Finally, he engages in a smuggling enterprise with some criminal companions, and severely wounds the brigadier of the coast-guard in a night affray. He is sentenced to the galleys for a term of years. At the trial a still more crushing disgrace even than his grandson's condemnation awaits Padron 'Ntoni. The young man's advocate, unable to deny that he stabbed the brigadier, appeals to the court on the ground of the intolerable provocation received by 'Ntoni Malavoglia from the notorious fact of the brigadier's having seduced his youngest sister, Lia. This falls like a thunderbolt on 'Ntoni, who, in fact, has never had any suspicion of the kind. As to the grandfather, he sees 'Ntoni rise up among the carbinciers who guard him, "tearing his cap to pieces in his hands, his eyes staring like a madman's, and endeavouring to speak." The old man sees this figure for a moment, but then sees nothing more. There is a rushing noise in his ears, and he falls senseless on the floor of the court. When, a short time later, he is supported home tottering and bowed to the earth, he learns that Lia has fled from her home. She is supposed to have taken refuge with her lover, the brigadier, Don Michele. The fact is that up to that moment the girl's relations with Don Michele have been innocent. But she is young, pretty, and very vain. There is in her the same strain of self-indulgent egotism as in her brother 'Ntoni. But she has not been criminal. Now, however, half-maddened by the publicity of her disgrace (reported to her by a dozen neighbourly tongues in terms of reproach), she leaves her home. She is never heard of more in the family; but the reader is allowed to understand that she sinks into nameless infamy, and is lost in the lowest social depths of a great city.

The record of the Malavoglias' misfortunes, thus condensed into a few words, is horribly oppressive. Even in the novel itself their story is one of almost unrelieved sadness. The only gleam of light falls on Alessi, the youngest son, who prospers sufficiently to buy back their old home, the House of the Medlar-tree, and marries a good industrious girl whom he has known from childhood, and who has a pretty and touching little story of her own. Mena remains unmarried. The shadow of her sister's disgrace is upon her, and although she is sought in marriage she refuses to bring dishonour into an honest man's house. She lives with Alessi and his wife, Nunziata, and devotes herself to their children. The end of the fine

old hero Padron 'Ntoni is profoundly pathetic. After the trial of 'Ntoni and Lia's flight he becomes bedridden, and longs for death. Alessi and Mena are dutiful and affectionate, but the old man's heart is broken. The one dread that remains to him is lest he should be sent to the poor-house or the hospital. There are not wanting sage counsellors who urge Alessi to send his grandfather to the hospital in a neighbouring town. There he will be taken good care of, and cost no money, whereas at home he is a burthen to himself and others. Alessi resists this heartless worldly-wise advice; but one day when he is absent at his work Padron 'Ntoni, having overheard the neighbours discussing the matter, offers of his own accord to go to the hospital, and relieve his grandchildren of a useless burthen. A neighbour carries him thither on his cart, and the old man is left in a little bed among rows of other beds in a long white-washed room. Alessi is greatly distressed when he hears what has been done, and vows he will have his grandfather brought back forthwith; but the days slip by and the return is postponed. They go from time to time to visit the old man in the hospital; but one day Padron 'Ntoni makes that long voyage—"longer than to Trieste, or to Alexandria in Egypt, from whence no one ever returns."

"When his name would come up in their talk as they rested under the shadow of the medlar-tree, with their supper on their knees, reckoning up the gains of the week, and making plans for the future, the chatter would cease all of a sudden. Each one fancied he had the poor old man before his eyes, as he looked when they saw him last. He was in that great bare room full of rows of beds, so that they had to seek about before they found him. Their grandfather was expecting them like a soul in purgatory with his eyes fixed on the door; though indeed he could hardly see at all now. And he kept touching them to make sure it was they themselves. He said nothing, but you could see in his face that he wanted to say many things. And it was heart-breaking to read the trouble in his face, which he could not express. When they told him that they had bought back the House of the Medlar-tree, and that they were going to bring him back to Trozza once more, he seemed to say 'yes! yes!' with his eyes, which brightened up. And he almost made up his mouth into a smile—that smile of those who have left off smiling, or who smile for the last time, which sticks in your heart like a knife! That's how the Malavoglias felt when on the Monday they went back with the cart and the donkey to fetch their grandfather, and found him there no more."

The defects of the book consist chiefly in a too great lack of cohesion between the parts, and a certain vagueness in delineating, not persons, but incidents. Events are presented in the same fragmentary fashion in which they meet our observation in daily life. The co-ordination and assimilation—the mental digestion, in a word—of facts, which each man has to perform for himself in real life, the novelist usually does for us in his work of art. Verga gives the reader scarcely any help of this kind; not, certainly, because he could not, but because he is resolved to be true to the theories we have already alluded to.

FRANCES ELEANOR TROLLOPE.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW AS A BRANCH OF POLITICS.¹

WE have become accustomed in this country to look upon law as a subject so technical and difficult, not to say repulsive, that nobody but lawyers can well meddle with it. Lawyers, again, are for the practical purposes of their business concerned with the laws as they are, not as they have been. Consequently the history of English law has remained a sealed book to the vast majority of educated Englishmen, and has been studied by a mere handful of scholars. In other words, the greater part of educated Englishmen have not known, and have practically not had the means of knowing, a vital part of the history of their own country. To make my meaning clear on this point, let me remind you for a moment what history is not. Many of us, no doubt, can remember having written out and learnt in our childhood long lists of dates, with what are called events opposite them; accessions and deaths of kings, battles, pestilences, the Gunpowder Plot, the Great Fire of London, and so forth. That is not history; it is only a part of the skeleton of history, and not the most important part. The signing of Magna Carta, for instance, is one of the events we should expect to find in any table of the leading dates of English history. Well, but the table of dates will not tell us what Magna Carta was; and if you go to the history-books that English schoolboys had to learn from till a few years ago, they will not tell you much about it that is worth knowing. What can we learn from the old-fashioned school histories about Magna Carta? Something of this kind: King John ruled very badly, and his barons rose up against him, and made him promise to rule better (only it would be told in much longer words, for people who write school-books seem to think that the smaller a boy is, the bigger words you must cram down his throat); and so they all met at Runnymede, and he signed a charter which has ever since been called the Great Charter; and then there would be some flourish about the birthright of every Englishman's liberties, and trial by jury, and his house being his castle. That is what used to pass for history; it is a little bit more than the bare dates, but a long way from being history still. We want to know how and why the Great Charter was a landmark of English freedom, and why its promise waxed and grew instead of coming to naught. If King John promised to rule better, so have a great many princes before and after him. Look at the present state of Turkey, where the Sultans have

(1) A lecture delivered before the Sunday Lecture Society.

been doing nothing but promise to govern better any time this quarter of a century. If charters and promises and good laws written on paper made good government, the Ottoman Empire would be one of the best governed states in the world. Indeed, our Great Charter is a confused rambling kind of document to look at, and I dare say the Turkish laws and proclamations are much more elegantly written. So that, before we can say that we have attained real historical knowledge, we must at least begin to see our way to understanding why Magna Carta is a precious and venerable monument of English history, while Turkish charters are waste paper. Now to understand that we must understand something of the men who won the Great Charter from King John, and of the institutions they lived under. We must be able to read the Charter not only with our eyes but with our wits, so as to see what it really meant to the people of that time. But now observe that the Great Charter is a legal document. It is full of legal provisions and safeguards, and if we try to make it out without knowing something of the legal institutions of England at the beginning of the thirteenth century, we shall find most of it either unmeaning or misleading. Thus we are plunged into law whether we will or no; there is no help for it if we want to get to the bottom of things, or anywhere near the bottom, but we must go to work and master the legal facts and ideas that statesmen and reformers of the thirteenth century had to deal with. And this is true in a greater or less degree at every stage and period of the growth of our Constitution. Just now I said something about the skeleton or dry bones of history. We may say with more truth and fitness that law is to political institutions as the bones to the body. It is the framework from which institutions take their form; and it is no more possible to be a serious student of history without learning a good deal of law than it is possible to draw the human figure correctly without learning its anatomy. For the same reasons the study of law becomes interesting when one begins to learn its history, and the manner in which its growth is entwined with the growth of English institutions in general. And we find nowadays that our best historians—I will only name one whose right to the first place all competent persons acknowledge, Professor Stubbs—are not frightened by the difficulties of legal history; they grapple fully and fairly with the old records of the law, and, so far from being content to know less about them than we lawyers do, they bring out a great many important things which lawyers either did not know or neglected. It is no business of mine to praise their work as historians: it is but a poor compliment, if it be not an impertinence, for a learner to commend his masters. But as a lawyer I am free to admire the diligence and accuracy of their work on legal ground, and to express my thanks to them for the powerful aid

they have given to dispel the fictions and perverse explanations of facts which have too long encumbered our law books. And the fact that they have done this will suffice, I hope, to remove any suspicion you may entertain that I am crying up the study of legal history because I am a lawyer, after the example of the shoemaker who cried "Nothing like leather."

What I should like to do to-day is to give you some notion of the way in which legal institutions and ideas have been a great and effectual power in politics, so that our political institutions and ideas are not only distinctively English, but have a distinctive colouring of English law. It would, of course, be impossible to do this in any detail, or over any great extent of English history, in the time we have before us. Perhaps the best thing we can do is to take a glance at the legal aspect of English politics at some of the critical periods when our institutions were being most actively made or repaired. Three such periods offer themselves at once: those which are marked by the great constructive work that took place in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, by the struggle between King and Parliament which led to the Civil War and the Commonwealth, and by the formation of the modern constitution after the abdication of James II. and election of William III. At all three points we shall find well shown, though in somewhat different ways, the part played by law and men imbued with legal ideas in the practical work of English politics. First we take the mediæval period, which at present is the least familiar to educated Englishmen. Practically it was not accessible to any but special students until Professor Stubbs published his great work on our Constitutional History; that was only seven years ago, and besides, it must be allowed that Professor Stubbs is not a popular writer. I fear that the greater part of those who now read his book do it having the fear of an examination before their eyes. However, the matter of it is fast finding its way into smaller and more popular books; but for the present we must count it among things not generally known, that the latter half of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth centuries were in England a time of most vigorous and able constructive work. Almost all our institutions, one may say, were about that time put into a shape still easy to perceive in what they are now. Not that these things were unknown to scholars twenty or thirty years ago, or could not be got at by taking a certain amount of trouble; but that is just what ordinary readers of history never think of doing. And the proof of this is the fashion in which popular writers used to talk till quite lately—possibly some do it still—about the Middle Ages. If one took them for authorities, one would suppose the Middle Ages were a time of nothing but darkness, dirt, ignorance, and crime, in which nobody knew anything worth knowing, or did anything worth

doing. One would imagine mediæval society as divided into wicked lords who lived in castles, poor wretches who were oppressed by them, and hypocritical priests who thought of nothing but making money out of the lay people of all sorts. Anybody who thinks of the past in that way must change his frame of mind before he is even on the road to understand either English history or any other. I am not for a moment going to deny that we are more civilised, infinitely better equipped with the conveniences of life, and on the whole much better and happier than our forefathers were six or seven centuries ago. A little study of history explodes the fancies of romance-writers about the good old times, just as much as the fancy of popular teachers that the old times were good for nothing. But that is in great part because we are reaping at this day the fruit of the work our forefathers did according to their lights. We think it a simple matter of course, for instance, that our lives and property should be safe from open violence, that justice should not be bought and sold, that on the one hand no man should be punished without lawful cause, and, on the other hand, no private man should be strong enough to defy the law. But such-like things were not matters of course to the rulers and statesmen of the Middle Ages; they were things to be worked hard for, now and then to be fought for; and if they did their work with a rough hand sometimes, I hardly think it lies in our mouths to blame them, considering what things have been done in our days by the most civilised of governments. And when people say that the Middle Ages invented nothing, I wonder if they think it nothing to have invented Parliament, the pattern of representative government which has been more or less followed by all Western Christendom. But the piece of work I want to call your attention to now is one that came before Parliament. The time was not ripe for Parliaments till there was a fairly settled, strong, and regular system of order and justice. And the needful settlement and strengthening were brought about chiefly by measures which we should now call law reform.

For nearly a century after the Norman Conquest executive government, as we understand it, can hardly be said to have existed in England. The power of the Crown, though nominally much more undefined than in modern times, was less for almost all useful purposes. It was understood to be the right and the duty of the Crown to keep the peace, the king's peace as it was already called.¹

(1) Modern writers intent on fitting facts into their theories about so-called primitive ideas have inferred from this that peace-breaking was made criminal only through a sort of legal fiction of its being a personal offence to the king. Centuries before the Conquest our ancestors know better than that. The term really marks the establishment of the conception of public justice, exercised on behalf of the whole commonwealth, as something apart from and above the right of private vengeance—a right which the party offended might pursue, or not, or accept composition for, as he thought

But this did not prevent those who were strong enough from settling their disputes by private war ; and down to the end of the twelfth century this appears to have been considered a not unlawful proceeding. Instances of private warfare (apart, of course, from actual civil war waged for political causes affecting the common weal) occur much later. Then there was no general system of administering justice common to the whole country : and this is the point I want you especially to mark. In every county and hundred there were ancient popular courts, courts which every free man might be called upon to attend, just as every free man was in theory entitled to be present and have a voice at the great council which before the Conquest wielded supreme power together with the king, the Witenagemot or Witan, that is, meeting of the wise men of the land. When I speak of popular courts, you must not suppose that they were popular in any modern sense. It is doubtful whether the greater number of those who took part in the proceedings had any effectual voice, and it is certain that there was not even an attempt to do speedy and substantial justice. Ancient simplicity is one of the illusions that vanish before historical criticism. The farther we go back in the history of institutions, the more we find people enslaved by formalities, and, indeed, as we should now think, wholly neglecting the substance of affairs for the form. And English history is no exception. All these local courts had their own particular customs ; we know that these customs were so many and different that it was thought hopeless to describe them, and there is every reason to believe that they were extremely technical and cumbrous, and abounded in pitfalls quite unconnected with the merits of the case. All ancient procedure is typified in the old Roman story of a man who sued a neighbour for cutting down his vines, and failed because the Law of the Twelve Tables spoke only of *trees* in general, and he ought to have followed the very words of the law, and said *trees* instead of *vines*. Similar stories are told of the old German laws, and no doubt many like things happened in the old English hundred and county courts. There is some evidence, too, that attendance at these courts was found vexatious by the smaller folk, who could ill afford to leave their own affairs for them. In the same way we used to flatter ourselves that trial by jury was an ancient popular institution ; perhaps it may be connected with the name of King Alfred in some books that are still read. It is nothing of the kind. All the details of the story are not made out yet, but it is fairly certain that our modern jury trials arose gradually out of a system of inquiry by sworn commissioners, invented by princes chiefly for

fit. The private blood-feud, it is true, formally and finally disappeared from English jurisprudence only in the present century ; but in its legalised historical shape of the wager of battle it was not a native English institution.

the purpose of securing their own revenue, and to evade the formalities and dangers of the old-fashioned popular procedure. The jury, in civil cases at all events, comes not at all from the popular court, but from the king's court. This, however, is too long to enter into now. Let us go on and see what the king's court was. In the larger sense it was the council of great men with whose advice and assistance he acted in affairs of State, the provisional successor of the old English Witan. In a narrower sense, it was this council acting judicially, or a judicial committee of it.¹ Already the notion existed that the Crown had a general judicial supremacy over the kingdom, the notion expressed somewhat later by the maxim that the king is the fountain of justice. But the judicial power of the Crown was not exercised by any constant or certain means. Great men in immediate attendance on the court, bishops, and heads of great religious houses, any one, in short, who was high or strong enough to command the king's attention or rich enough to buy it, procured their causes to be dealt with in the first instance by the king's court, or removed into it from the local courts; and they obtained, after great expense and delay, an administration of justice which, though it looks rude enough to us, was probably much in advance of the proceedings of the local courts. Much complaint is now made of the cost of litigation, and not altogether unjustly; but in the twelfth century it was something enormous. The king's justice was one great source of his revenue, and he sold it very dear. Observe that this buying and selling was not in itself corruption, though it is hard to believe that corruption did not get mixed up with it. Suitors paid heavily not to have causes decided in their favour in the king's court, but to have them heard there at all. The king's justice was not a matter of right, but of exceptional favour; and this was especially the case when he undertook, as he sometimes did, to review and overrule the actual decisions of the local courts, or even reverse, on better information, his own previous commands. And not only was the king's writ sold, but it was sold at arbitrary and varying prices, the only explanation of which appears to be that in every case the king's officers took as much as they could get.² Now we are in a position to understand that famous clause of the Great Charter: "To no man will we sell, nor to none deny or delay, right or justice." The Great Charter comes about half a century after the time of which we have been speaking; so in that time, you see, the great advance

(1) The phrase has been objected to, but I think over-captiously. Anyhow, I am content to be inaccurate, if inaccuracy there is, in Professor Stubbs's company. Those who wish to be precise beyond question may take the alternative of "sections" suggested by Mr. Freeman (*Norman Conquest*, 5, 878).

(2) Bigelow, "*History of Procedure in England*," 153. I am not so confident as Mr. Bigelow that executive writs of this kind were ever really issued without some judicial consideration; but for the present purpose this is not material.

had been made of regarding the king's justice as a matter not of favour but of right. And besides this clause there is another which provides for the regular sending of the king's judges into the counties. Thus we may date from Magna Carta the regular administration of a uniform system of law throughout England. What is more, we may almost say that Magna Carta gave England a capital. For the king's court had till then no fixed seat; it would be now at Oxford, now at Westminster, now at Winchester, sometimes at places which by this time are quite obscure. But the Charter provided that causes between subject and subject which had to be tried by the king's judges should be tried not where the king's court happened to be, but in some certain place; and so the principal seat of the courts of justice, and ultimately the political capital of the realm, became established at Westminster.

Of course these things were neither done all at once nor took their full effect all at once. The king's justices, for instance, had made rounds of the country long before the Great Charter, and Henry II. had reduced this to something like a system; but this was in the first instance chiefly for the purposes of the king's revenue. The king's court was the instrument of collecting his dues as well as of doing his justice. The sheriff, whose place was in those days anything but a merely ornamental one, was answerable to the Exchequer for the revenue of his county; but the justices and barons of the king's court went round from time to time to readjust valuations, hear complaints, and control the local authority. Gradually they drew to themselves, as representing the king, the administration of justice as well as of revenue matters; and at length in Magna Carta we have justices who are sent out for purely judicial purposes, though still with a limited jurisdiction. The powers of our present judges of assize were gradually added at different times. But to this day the judges of assize are received with the honours due to the Queen's representatives, and as such take precedence of every one in the county.¹ Thus the local courts were little by little superseded (though in the City of London and several other cities and towns ancient local courts, more or less modified for the convenience of modern times, have gone on down to our own day), and one and the same law was regularly administered in the king's name. The immediate effect, no doubt, was to increase the power of the Crown at the expense of local potentates and jurisdictions. It was what we now call a centralizing measure. But another effect

(1) The technical reason of this, according to the late Mr. Justice Willes, whose wide and exact knowledge of English legal history has probably never been surpassed, is that, whereas the sheriff has a writ of assistance directed to all archbishops, bishops, &c., the judges of assize have a like writ directed to the sheriff himself. See on the whole matter of the origin and dignity of their court his judgment in *Ex parte Fernandez*, 10 Common Bench Reports, N.S., pp. 42—56.

was to make the profession of the law a distinct, powerful, and dignified one, having a good deal of independence even as against the Crown; and the constitutional results of this were most important when the time came, nearly five centuries later, for the great contest between the King and the Commons. Nor must we forget the effect the circuits of the king's judges, and the pleaders who then as now followed the court from place to place, must have had in uniting the people of England in the possession of a common stock of legal and political ideas. The institution of the jury presents a remarkable parallel to this. Devised at first, like the missions of the travelling judges, for the convenience of the Crown in securing its own rights, we see it become an instrument of doing justice between subject and subject, and at length a safeguard for the subject against the power of the Crown. Now mark in all this the ceaseless action and reaction of law and politics on one another. We begin with arrangements which we should now call political rather than legal, made for the better or more profitable conduct of government. You must remember that the distinction of professions and departments was nothing like so sharp as it is now; things were, so to speak, all shaken up together, and gradually being settled and shaped into their places; and so institutions could be transformed and put to fresh uses much more easily than we can do it nowadays. Then these devices expand into fixed legal institutions, which in some measure we have preserved to this day. Then the legal institutions acquire a kind of independent existence, and afford in turn a rallying-point and leverage for politics. Not only there is the idea of law being supreme even over the king, but the law is something visible and embodied; it has its proper organs and can make itself heard, if need be, at a political crisis. When I speak of the law being supreme, I mean that this was fully and clearly realised by our mediæval writers. Let me tell you what was said about this by Bracton, a few years after the middle of the thirteenth century. Bracton wrote a great systematic treatise on English law, the first of its kind, and this is what he says in one place of the king: "Now the king hath one set over him, that is, God. Likewise the law, whereby he is made king. Likewise his own court, to wit his barons and earls; for earls are called *comites*, as being the king's companions, and who hath a companion hath a master. So if the king be without bridle, that is without law, they must put the bridle upon him;"¹ and then Bracton goes on to say that, in case the king and the barons should all be unrighteous together, justice will be done upon

(1) This passage was cited, but not fairly or relevantly, on the first and last occasion where Charles I. had the law clearly on his side: see 4 St. Tr., 1009. There would be something grotesque, if the matter were less grave, in vouching Bracton to warrant the jurisdiction of the High Court of Justice to try the king for treason. .

them in the next world, if not in this. And in another place he speaks thus: "The king ought not to be under any man, but under God and under the law, because the law makes him king. Therefore let the king render to the law what the law renders to him; that is dominion and power, for he is no king if his will rules and not the law." In yet another place this is repeated in almost the same terms. There you have in a nutshell, laid down by an English lawyer of the thirteenth century, the great point of English constitutional freedom, that law is not merely the instrument of government, but the safeguard of each individual citizen's public rights and liberties. It is sad to think that nevertheless there were English kings long afterwards who found lawyers and judges willing to give them opinions of quite another sort.¹ Still they thought it needful to have these opinions on their side. Even in the days when the liberties of Englishmen seemed most nearly forgotten, acts of tyranny had to be fortified with at least a show of legality. There is one great safeguard in particular which has always held its own. In this country no officer of the State, however high his office, can exceed or abuse his lawful authority without being liable to be sued in the ordinary courts of justice like any other wrongdoer. So much are we accustomed to this right that we hardly look on it as a privilege. Of course it will not do everything. In bad times it could not prevent servile Parliaments from creating oppressive authorities with oppressive powers, nor could it protect the suitor against packed juries or obsequious judges. But if we look abroad for a moment, we shall see that in many other countries, I think we may say in all or nearly all Continental countries, no such right of the subject exists at this day. Acts done by executive officers of the State in the course of their functions are subject to the control of the executive government only, and removed from the jurisdiction of ordinary courts. If we try to conceive what Englishmen would think of living under such a law, we shall not find it hard to appreciate the value of our own. A curious illustration of the English rule is afforded by an authority repeatedly cited in the arguments on the great case of Habeas Corpus under Charles I. Edward IV. was informed by one of his judges that the king can in no case arrest a subject in person, for this reason, that if the arrest should not be justified, the subject would lose his lawful remedy of an action of false imprisonment, as the king cannot be personally sued.

This point I have just mentioned exhibits in a striking way a character of great political importance for which the English race is eminent—I mean the quality called law-abidingness. We and our kinsfolk in America love to think ourselves a law-abiding people.

(1) One may well guess that the reprinting of Bracton in 1640 was not unconnected with the political circumstances of the time.

We like to have the sanction, or at least the analogy, of precedent and law for whatever we do. This, be it marked, is a very different thing from the habit of submission to persons in authority; our respect is for the law, not for the persons. Now this habit of mind appears in the earliest history of English law. The appeal to precedent which is the foundation of our modern jurisprudence is evident in records of a date soon after the Conquest. And I cannot help thinking that the circumstances of the Conquest had something to do with the way in which this idea took root in English law and government. William the Conqueror won his English crown by hard fighting, as we all know; but he did not claim it merely by the right of the stronger: he maintained that he was the rightful king of the English, and Harold was a usurper. His case was wrong according to the English constitution of that time, because Harold had been duly chosen for king by the people and the Witan, and William had not. Still the claim had in more than one way a fair colour of right about it, and William made a great point of coming in by law and not barely by force.¹ There were great confiscations of the lands of Englishmen who resisted, but otherwise English laws and customs were observed as they had been under the English kings, or as nearly as might be. Thus Norman rulers had to administer a system with which they were not familiar, and there must naturally have been a great deal of local inquiry, searching for precedents, and ascertaining usages from the people on the spot who knew most about it. In fact we see much of the process in the great land survey known as the Domesday Book. And the natural effect of this, again, would be to make the importance of precedent and established custom more sharply and strongly felt. We know that in British India, where English judges and magistrates have been set to work to administer Hindu and Mussulman systems of law, the result has been to give to the native laws a certainty and fixity, and even an activity and binding force, which they had not before. It is true that English lawyers brought their notion of judicial precedents and the like to India all ready made; and native Indian laws and usages are immensely more unlike ours than English institutions were unlike Norman ones. Yet I think the analogy is sufficient to be not worthless; and I will venture to say, as at least an allowable guess, that some such effect was also produced in England under the time of Anglo-Norman rule which followed the Conquest. This feeling of the sanctity of precedent has had something to do with the formalism and pedantry that have been the plague of English law, and are not quite got rid of yet. But we must never forget that it

(1) The evidence is worked out in detail by Mr. Freeman in the two last volumes of his *History of the Norman Conquest*, especially the chapter on Domesday, and the notes thereto.

has likewise been a most powerful weapon in the hands of champions of English freedom. Its power is shown by the efforts that were made to escape it. When English sovereigns were reproached with unauthorized and unexampled acts of despotism, they taxed all the ingenuity of their servants to find in the records of past reigns anything that looked like example or authority. So here again, if I am right, we see the political circumstances of the country forming or strengthening a certain habit of mind in legal matters, and this again becoming a national temper which plays a great part in politics. The difference between fighting for the ancient rights of one's fathers and for a claim to some new right which nobody quite understands is like the difference between having a wall at your back and standing in open ground.

Before we leave the Middle Ages there is another matter of legal and historical importance to say one word about. In the time we have been speaking of there was a keen rivalry between the secular and the ecclesiastical courts. To this day every bishop has his court, but the jurisdiction is practically confined to the clergy, and even so things of real importance are seldom concluded there. But in the twelfth century, and for centuries after, it was far otherwise. The spiritual courts exercised a kind of general supervision over manners and morals, and interfered with private life in almost every detail. Besides this, they struggled hard for jurisdiction over almost everything that seemed nearly or remotely connected with ecclesiastical discipline or interests. For example, they claimed the exclusive right of dealing with all causes relating to marriage, and that with considerable success. The history is an extremely curious one, but at this time I can only call attention to one aspect of it. The spiritual courts had, no doubt, their good side; they could give relief in many cases where, owing to the limited number of legal causes of action which were then admitted, it could not be had in the king's courts. But the meddlesomeness and petty tyranny that could be, and frequently were, exercised through them were such as a modern reader can hardly believe; and when one has learnt something of this, it becomes much easier to understand why the Reformation was so much of a political success in England, and why the people looked on with so much equanimity at the wholesale dissolution of religious houses (many of which had ecclesiastical courts attached to them) and confiscation of Church property.

Now I must ask you to pass over four centuries, and come to the great fight which the Commons of England fought against the Stuart dynasty for the better part of a century. I say the Stuart dynasty with a distinct meaning. The contest which ended with the downfall and exile of the last Stuart king was fully and deliberately begun by the first, as I shall immediately show you by one of its earliest records.

It is a long and momentous chapter of English history, but at present we are concerned with only one aspect of it, the extent to which the contest was waged on legal ground and with legal arguments. Down to the very outbreak of the Civil War the dispute between the Crown and its advisers on the one side and Parliament on the other had a distinctly forensic turn. In his most high-flying claims the king always professed to be maintaining no more than the just and ancient powers of his predecessors, and was never at a loss for more or less plausible arguments to that effect. In their most stubborn resistance the Commons never, until actual hostilities were imminent, quitted the firm ground of established rights and liberties. The great points in issue were two: whether the Crown could levy taxes and impositions, on any occasions or under any name, without the consent of Parliament; and whether the king in Council had a discretionary power of imprisoning men, and keeping them imprisoned, without assigning any cause beyond his own special command. A third question, and one connected with very weighty practical grievances, though in the later stages of the conflict it rather fell into the background, arose upon the assumption of the Crown to make by proclamation, without the authority of Parliament, a variety of rules and ordinances, amounting to petty legislation, in almost every department of administrative government, and in some matters we now think beyond the province of Government altogether. All through the time, covering something more than a generation, between the first encroachments of James and the final breach of Charles with the Parliament, these things were argued as questions not of policy but of existing law. There was, of course, a strong sense and purpose of policy underneath the legal contentions of both parties; but both parties were anxious above all things to get the law on their own side. I will now read to you the very words in which the Commons brought their grievances before James I. as early as 1610, in the matter of impositions and proclamations. And let me just note in passing that if you want to form a lively conception of any period of history, and enter into the thoughts and feelings of the men you are reading about, there is only one sure way that I know of; and that is to get hold, as far as you can, of records and documents of the time itself, and not be content with what other people tell you about them. It seems troublesome at first, but it saves more trouble in the end; and as regards English history at any rate it is an infinitely easier thing to do than it was fifty or even twenty years ago.

This is what the Commons said to James I. in 1610 about impositions levied without consent of Parliament¹:—

“The policy and constitution of this your kingdom appropriates unto the

(1) 2 *State Trials*, 519.

kings of this realm, with the assent of the Parliament, as well the sovereign power of making laws as that of taxing or imposing upon the subject's goods or merchandizes, wherein they have justly such a propriety, as may not without their consent be altered or changed.

"This is the cause that the people of this kingdom, as they ever showed themselves faithful and loving to their kings, and ready to aid them in all their just occasions with voluntary contributions; so have they been ever careful to preserve their own liberties and rights, when anything hath been done to prejudice or impeach the same.

"And, therefore, when their princes, occasioned either by their wars or their over great bounty, or by any other necessity, have, without consent of Parliament, set impositions either within the land or upon commodities either exported or imported by the merchants, they have in open Parliament complained of it, in that it was done without their consents, and thereupon never failed to obtain a speedy and full redress, without any claim made by the kings of any power or prerogative in that point. And though the law of propriety be originally and carefully preserved by the common laws of the realm, which are as ancient as the kingdom itself; yet these famous kings, for the better contentment and assurance of their loving subjects, agreed that this old fundamental right should be farther declared and established by Act of Parliament: wherein it is provided that no such charges should ever be laid upon the people without their common consent, as may appear by sundry records of former times.

"We, therefore, your Majesty's most humble Commons, assembled in Parliament, following the example of this worthy case of our ancestors, and out of a duty to those for whom we serve, finding that your Majesty, without advice or consent of Parliament, hath lately in time of peace set both greater impositions and far more in number than any your noble ancestors did ever in time of war, have with all humility presumed to present this most just and necessary petition unto your Majesty, that all impositions set without the assent of Parliament may be quite abolished and taken away."

You see how carefully and pointedly the right is claimed as a matter of established law. Then comes the complaint against arbitrary proclamations, which is if possible yet more distinct in this respect:—

"Amongst many other points of happiness and freedom which your Majesty's subjects of this kingdom have enjoyed under your royal progenitors, kings and queens of this realm, there is none which they have accounted more dear and precious than this, to be guided and governed by certain rule of law, which giveth both to the head and members that which of right belongeth to them, and not by any uncertain or arbitrary form of government. . . . Out of this root hath grown the indubitable right of the people of this kingdom not to be made subject to any punishment that shall extend to their lives, lands, bodies, or goods, other than such as are ordained by the common laws of this land, or the statutes made by their common consent in Parliament."

This prelude marked out with sufficient clearness the lines to be taken by the great struggle, when Charles I. endeavoured to carry through the policy he had inherited from his father. Seventeen years after this petition of grievances was addressed to James, Charles raised money by a forced loan. There was a widespread feeling in the country that the whole thing was against law, and many gentlemen of good standing and substance wholly refused to contribute. "I was called," one of them said afterwards, "before

the Lords of the Council, for what I know not. I heard it was for not lending on a Privy Seal. I told them, if they will take my estate, let them—I will give it up; lend I will not." In the end several of the recusants were committed to prison. Five of these reclaimed their liberty, and sought the aid of the Courts to be enlarged. As it was impossible to charge them with any specific offence known to the law, the question was whether they could be imprisoned by the mere executive authority of the king and the Privy Council. Hence arose a memorable discussion of the subject's right to personal liberty, first before the judges of the King's Bench, and afterwards in Parliament. In Court the result was inconclusive; the judges would neither go directly against the king nor commit themselves to giving a decision completely in his favour. But the matter was taken up in the House of Commons, and that with quite as elaborate and technical an apparatus of learning as had been brought before the judges. If lawyers on the bench were timid or servile then, and were still more servile a few years later, there were lawyers enough in Parliament, and learned ones too, who could use their knowledge in the cause of freedom. Both James and Charles spoke in terms of bitter complaint of their opposition. And their task was a harder one than it seems at first sight to a reader of the present day, not only as regards the boldness it required, but as regards the apparent merits of the argument. Modern research has on the whole amply borne out the Whig view of the controversy, if we may so call it by anticipation. The claims of the Commons were not only justified by policy and the common weal, but well warranted on the purely historical grounds which were assigned for them. Yet the case for the Crown was not hopeless. The terms and the spirit of Magna Carta, the repeated confirmation of it all through the Middle Ages, and in general the weight of early authority, were doubtless on the side of the Parliament. But recent practice was no less on the side of the king; and on questions of constitutional law the practice of nearly a century is a formidable thing to deal with. The Tudor sovereigns had frequently, if not constantly, done things as high-handed and as difficult to justify by law as anything Charles I. had yet attempted. The difference was that their government, on the whole, had been popular, and they knew where to stop. If in their time money was raised irregularly, it was for genuine public purposes. If men were imprisoned arbitrarily, it was not for defending the rights of the whole commonalty. If commands of doubtful legality were issued, it was in matters of real emergency. Henry VIII. and Elizabeth would certainly have repudiated the position of a modern constitutional monarch. But they sought to lead their parliaments and people, not to force them; they never committed the fatal mistake of

raising money by unparliamentary means on purpose to make themselves independent of Parliament. Thus the substantial answer to the precedents of the sixteenth century—a good answer, I think, both in law and in policy—was that, if the Tudors were allowed to carry things with a high hand, it was by an acquiescence confined to the particular times and occasions, not by the allowance which makes a binding custom. In our own time we have seen how executive authority may be strained to the verge of legality by a popular and powerful minister, with success for the time being, if not altogether with subsequent impunity. This remark is not made in the interest of one political party more than another, for it applies equally to Mr. Gladstone and to Lord Beaconsfield. If, however, a lesser man than these should ever attempt to follow the precedent of bringing Indian troops to Malta, or the abolition of purchase in the army by royal warrant after a Bill for the same purpose had failed to pass through Parliament, he might find himself seriously mistaken. And in somewhat the same fashion, only on a greater and more fatal scale, Charles I. found himself mistaken when he tried to wield the sceptre of the Tudors.

The rights of the Crown and of the subject were argued in the House of Commons, as I said, by members who were among the first lawyers of the day—such men as John Selden and Sir Edward Coke. And after this argument the House passed the following resolutions on the pressing question of personal freedom¹:—

“1. That no free man ought to be detained or kept in prison, or otherwise restrained by the command of the King or Privy Council, or any other, unless some cause of the commitment, detainer, or restraint be expressed, for which by law he ought to be committed, detained, or restrained.

“2. That the writ of Habeas Corpus may not be denied, but ought to be granted to every man that is committed or detained in prison, or otherwise restrained, though it be by command of the King, the Privy Council, or any other, he praying the same.

“3. That if a free man be committed or detained in prison, or otherwise restrained by the command of the King, the Privy Council, or any other, no cause of such commitment, detainer, or restraint being expressed, for which by law he ought to be committed, detained, or restrained, and the same be returned upon an Habeas Corpus granted for the said party; then he ought to be delivered or bailed.”

That is expressed almost in the form of a legal opinion, most carefully and strictly worded; a very different sort of thing from rhetorical declarations of supposed natural rights of man. Against the levying of taxes without the consent of Parliament the protests already made were yet more strongly and concisely renewed. The resolution on this head ran thus—

“That it is the ancient and indubitable right of every free man, that he hath a full and absolute property in his goods and estate; that no tax, tallage,

(1) 3 *State Trials*, 82. The date is March 29, 1628.

loan, benevolence, or other like charge ought to be commanded or levied by the King or any of his Ministers without common consent by Act of Parliament."

Two months after this the Petition of Right was sent up to the king, and after another month had been occupied by attempts on his part to put off the Parliament with an evasive answer, it received his assent in due form. This great instrument of English liberties is too long to quote; not that it is very long in itself, but that every clause would need a commentary. It is a recital of grievances committed against established laws, and ends with the prayer of the Lords and Commons that they may be removed, "All which they most humbly pray of your most excellent Majesty as their rights and liberties according to the laws and statutes of this realm." But it was many years before the Petition of Right was allowed to take any substantial effect; indeed, sixty years were to pass before its work was fully done and its harvest reaped—the harvest of just and settled liberties for the people of England, of exile and ignominy for the Stuarts. After giving his assent to the Petition, Charles dissolved the Parliament in indignation, and for eleven years ruled without summoning another; and the claim to levy taxes by the sole power of the Crown was revived in a new form in ship-money. In the great case between the Crown and Hampden we find as boldly advanced as ever the argument already used in the revenue cases of the former reign, that the king has two sorts of power—his ordinary prerogative, which is known to the law and defined by it; and an absolute or sovereign power, which is above the common law and even above Acts of Parliament. From the use of such an argument to the open defiance of law may seem to us at this day to be but a step; but it was a step that Charles dared not or would not take. He was still as anxious to be despotic by law as the Commons were to withstand him by law. The bench had been brought, by judicious dismissals and promotions, to be pretty well of one mind with the king and his counsellors, and a majority of the judges pronounced for the Crown against Hampden. One of the first acts of the Long Parliament was not merely to protest against Charles's proceedings in the matter of ship-money, but to declare this judgment void and bad in law. Here, we may say, is about the last point at which the legal character of the battle between king and Parliament is maintained. The Grand Remonstrance, presented by the Parliament in 1641, is distinctly a political manifesto. It covers, no doubt, all the ground covered by the Petition of Right, besides a great deal more; but it is impossible to turn from the Petition of Right to the Remonstrance without feeling that one has passed from a distinctly legal to a distinctly political atmosphere. It is worth remark that the one act which more than any other

made the Civil War inevitable, the king's attempted arrest of the five members early in the following year, was also the first act on his part which was manifestly and flagrantly illegal. It was unlawful, one may say, in every possible way. I am not aware that any sort of legal justification or excuse for it has ever been so much as attempted. In fact, Charles I.'s earlier proceedings were endeavours to wrest the constitution, then still more or less pliable, to his own sense; his aim in the matter of the five members was an undisguised *comp d'état*, and if it had succeeded he had made every preparation to pose as the saviour of society.

We said that it took sixty years for the Petition of Right to come to its full effect. The lapse of those sixty years brings us to the flight of James II. from the country whose freedom he had neither the strength to crush nor the prudence to propitiate with even a decent show of respect. Once more, and happily for the last time, an English Parliament counted up against an English king the tale of wrongs inflicted and promises broken. The same Bill of Rights which declared the abdication of the government by James II. and the acceptance of the throne by William and Mary set forth point by point the offences of James against the liberties of the nation, and point by point declared his acts illegal. In this the Lords and Commons explicitly professed to be doing as their ancestors in like case had usually done, and to claim and insist upon all the heads of grievance "as their undoubted rights and liberties." Here a question suggests itself, which may have occurred to you already when we spoke of the Petition of Right, and which we may usefully stop awhile to consider. The Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right, the Great Charter itself, all purport to do no more than make a solemn affirmation of rights already allowed. In every case the existing title of the subject to these rights was claimed, as I believe, in perfect good faith (though it does not follow that to some extent it might not be opposed in good faith also), and the claim was well made out. Yet historians tell us, and there is no doubt of the fact, that every one of these instruments is a landmark in the history of the Constitution. Since the Revolution, in particular, government has been altogether on a new footing. How can these facts be reconciled? How can political institutions be developed and transformed by putting on record existing legal rights? From a merely legal or a merely political point of view it seems a puzzle. The answer is to be sought in the interaction of politics and law which I have endeavoured to keep in view throughout this lecture. In legal theory the binding force of all laws is the same. The lawyer, as such, knows nothing of the political reasons which dictated them, the practical effects of their application, or the readiness or otherwise of the persons concerned to obey them. But their

operation is in fact modified in infinite degrees by all manner of social and political conditions. There are laws that wake and laws that slumber, laws that are strictly followed, laws that are evaded, and laws that are quietly neglected. The very same written law will take quite a different complexion by change of times, persons, and administration. Every school has its own comment on the text. The judges who were James II.'s instruments could not meddle with the Petition of Right in its actual terms, but they sent peaceful citizens and honourable women to execution on trifling or infamous evidence of imaginary treasons. Though far more despicable and servile than any of their predecessors under Charles or the first James, they could not repeat their performances in the matters of impositions and ship-money; but they discovered that the king had a supreme dispensing power which enabled him to undo for all practical purposes the work of the Reformation. The Bill of Rights was the declaration of a people whose long-suffering was exhausted that these things and such as these should no longer be. It was an exercise of political power to ensure that the legal securities for freedom and good government should be fully, fairly, and actively maintained in force. It was the determination of England that the laws which guarded the liberties of Englishmen should thenceforth wake and not sleep. To a great extent they had slept under the Tudors; they might have slept for generations more if Elizabeth had been succeeded by a ruler of men instead of a perverse pedant; even after the Commonwealth they might have again fallen into lethargy if Charles II. had learnt any lesson of statesmanship from his misfortunes, or James II. had been possessed of common prudence. Happily for the nation the accumulated follies of the Stuarts made this impossible. The Bill of Rights takes up the interrupted note of the Petition of Right, and is the last word of a nation who had trusted and had been deceived till they could trust no more. Legally there is nothing new, or hardly anything; politically there is the difference between taking a man's word and taking security.

But when we say that legally there is nothing new, this must not be understood in too large a sense. When you define a rule that existed in a less definite shape before, you cannot help adding something to it. Do what you will to make your statement a faithful interpretation and nothing more, still it is an interpretation, and thenceforth you have the new interpretation besides the old text, if text there was. Moreover, the interpretation is hardly ever the only possible one; it may be clearly the best, but the case must be exceptionally clear if no other can make anything like a fair show. A choice which was held more or less in suspense is fastened upon one reading or one shade of meaning in preference to another. The right or usage itself may be as ancient as you please, but the new

statement gives it a new fixity and force. Such a process is carried on every day by courts of justice in deciding disputed points of law. Their object is to ascertain what the legal rule is, not to add to it or alter it; but they cannot declare the rule without putting something more into it, and fixing, as it were, a new starting-point. Most of our law has been gradually built up in this fashion; and Acts of Parliament, so far from superseding this operation, make it more necessary than ever, since even the most carefully framed piece of legislation is sure to leave some room for doubt as to its application to the facts of particular cases. The Bill of Rights and the Petition of Right may be regarded as parliamentary definitions or interpretations of the more ancient instruments and customs on which the liberties of England were understood to rest. This is the more easily understood when we reflect how much the modern working of our Constitution depends on understandings which have never been defined by any positive authority. The Sovereign is still perfectly entitled, so far as positive law is concerned, to refuse assent to Bills sent up by the estates of the realm. No such body as the Cabinet, and no such person as a Prime Minister, is in any way known to the law. There are Privy Councillors and there is a First Lord of the Treasury; the Cabinet is a wholly informal committee of the Privy Council, and the First Lord of the Treasury is in an equally informal manner its chief. When Lord Beaconsfield described himself in the Treaty of Berlin as First Minister of England, it was remarked as a thing without precedent even in diplomatic documents. Our positive constitutional law takes no notice of the existence of parties or their leaders. It is a legal principle that the Crown can act only through Ministers who are responsible to Parliament; but the manner in which those Ministers are chosen, which is an extremely important part of the practical machinery of government, is outside legal definition and beyond legal control. There is not even any positive rule that Ministers who are not peers must have seats in the House of Commons. One might go on by the hour putting examples of things which would probably or certainly be unconstitutional in the sense of running counter to some of the understandings on which government is carried on, but which certainly would not be illegal. With this system of understandings the Constitution has worked smoothly for nearly half a century, and so long as it goes on working smoothly there will be no need for further definition. It is conceivable, however, that the necessity for it might somehow arise. In such a case it might happen that the Cabinet, like other committees of the Privy Council which began in an informal way, like the superior courts of justice themselves, should come to acquire a legal existence. A similar process, though not quite the same, is being exemplified before our eyes in

the House of Commons. The positive rules of debate are so framed as to leave an immense latitude to members and give immense opportunities for delay. They were framed, and long acted upon, on the assumption that members of the House of Commons would behave themselves as reasonable men and gentlemen, and would not obstruct public business for obstruction's sake. But in the last two or three years certain ingenious members have invented the policy of obstruction for the set purpose of bringing the whole proceedings of Parliament to a dead-lock, and thus intimidating the House into compliance with their demands. What is the result of this? After all the House is master of its own rules, and will not allow them to be notoriously abused. A new rule has already been made; and if that is not found effectual, we cannot doubt that other and more stringent measures will be taken. The understanding founded on trust having broken down, positive regulation becomes needful.

Thus far we have been considering the political aspect of actual laws and legal institutions. But legal ideas of a more abstract kind have also made their mark on politics, and a greater one than might be expected. One instance must suffice to illustrate this, but it shall be a striking one. We have just been speaking of the Revolution and the Bill of Rights. It may seem hardly serious to say that a considerable number of those who, after being more or less troubled with legal and other scruples, determined that their allegiance was no longer due to James II., were mightily fortified in their resolution by a legal fiction. Yet such is the plain fact. The Convention Parliament declared that James had "endeavoured to subvert the Constitution of the kingdom by breaking the original contract between king and people." This original contract, called by later writers the Social Contract, was nothing else than a supposed compact on which society and government were founded. It is hardly needful to state that such a compact is purely fictitious. It is a putting of the cart before the horse. There can be no contract until there are laws and government; and this theory seeks to explain the force of law by founding it on a prior contract. Men living in a state of individual independence are supposed to come together and agree to form a society, whereas we now know that individual rights and independence become possible only when society has reached a fairly advanced stage. It is the fallacy of carrying back modern legal notions to times and circumstances where the facts to which they are applicable do not exist. But it would be out of place here to discuss the doctrine of the Social Contract at any length, and the more so as it has been excellently treated by Mr. Leslie Stephen in his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. The curious point I wish to call your attention to is that this theory, being distinctly the offspring

of speculative minds under the influence of legal training, was eagerly seized upon for the service of practical politics by our statesmen of the Revolution.¹ The express engagements of the coronation oath might seem at first sight to give a better reason for declaring James in default. This, however, was suggested only to be put aside, ostensibly on the technical ground that the king is as much king, and therefore as much entitled to the subject's allegiance, and bound in turn to govern according to law, before he is crowned as after.² No doubt it was felt that a broader position must be taken as against the doctrine of absolute divine right. It may now seem to us incomprehensible that rational men should adopt or act upon such a doctrine, but at the time it had a real power, and troubled the consciences of many good men who were no friends of tyranny. To combat it with effect a counter theory was necessary, the time and the men not being ripe for a frank appeal to public utility. The happy fiction of the social contract was ready to hand, and smoothed over the difficulty. But though it deserves to be called happy to that extent, it is a still happier thing that the original contract, though it was prominent in the declaration of the two Houses, somehow did not find its way into the Bill of Rights. Had it been embodied in the Act which established the Protestant succession, it might have become for English citizens at large what it really was for a time to the Whig party, a political article of faith.

In the fragmentary view I have given you of some of the leading epochs in English politics, I have tried to make it plain to what an extent the forms of legal institutions, conceptions and claims of strictly legal right, and even the fictions of legal speculation, have entered into the very bones and marrow of the history of our country. We have at the same time, perhaps, obtained a glimpse of a much wider truth which also has its political significance, namely, that law and the machinery of law, like all other human institutions, grow and cannot be made to order. And if I have succeeded in bringing it home to any one of you that in the light of these ideas the critical and historical study of the laws of England is far from being the dry and crabbed business which most Englishmen still suppose it to be, I shall count my pains well rewarded.

FREDERICK POLLOCK.

(1) Hooker, whose authority Locke is glad to put forward on his side, appears to be the first considerable English author in whom the idea is found. It occurs in the Parliamentary debates of 1628, and in the trial of Charles I. There, however, the coronation oath is as much or more insisted upon.

(2) Lord Clarendon's speech, 5 *Parl. Hist.* 76.

NICHOLAS ALEXEIVITCH NEKRASOFF.

NICHOLAS ALEXEIVITCH NEKRASOFF was born November 22nd, 1821, in the government of Kamenetz-Podolski, at a small town where the regiment in which his father served happened to be then quartered. Whilst still young he lost his mother, a good and brave woman, who in her eighteenth year had fled from her Polish home with the poet's father, and who on many an occasion defended her children from his rough and tyrannous usage. In later years the poet loved to celebrate her virtues and beauty, as in the following lines taken from his well-known poem entitled *My Mother* :—

“ Born in a strange land, not less unhappy
But less harsh and sullen than our own,
Thou wert alone, from thy eighteenth year,
Alone in our morose dull clime of the north ;
And he, to whom fate had assigned thee,
And with whom thou trustingly fledst from home,
He ceased to love thee : but not so thou,
Only death could release thee from thy vow of love.
To thee I sing, dear mother, my hymn of repentance.
Praying thee, with warm tears of pity
From those soft blue eyes of thine
To wash each dark stain from out my soul.”

Soon after her death his father quitted the army with the rank of major, and retiring to the family estate near Yaroslaff accepted a place as Commissioner of the County Police. The duties of his office were fulfilled with that high-handed disregard of law and right which, in the old times preceding the establishment of regular tribunals of justice, for the most part characterized Russian police administration. The boy, then in his twelfth year, often accompanied his father in his official journeys, and was thus witness of cruel extortions practised on the poor peasantry, and scenes that left on his mind an indelible impression, the remembrance of which gave in after years a gloomy colouring to his pictures of Russian life :—

“ Once more I behold the familiar places,
Where the days of my fathers, barren and reckless,
Were passed in riot and in petty tyranny ;
Where the herd of oppressed and trembling slaves
Envied the free life of the dog and the horse ;
Where I was fated first to see the light of God's world,
And where I soon learned the lesson of patience and hate.”

He was placed first at a grammar school, and afterwards, in 1839, sent to a cadet's school at St. Petersburg ; but his aversion to the military service and his predilection for the literary profession were

so strong that he soon left the academy, and determined to prepare himself for the university. He thereby incurred the displeasure of his father, who immediately stopped all supplies, and Nekrasoff found himself reduced to a state of absolute penury. He himself has told us the story of these years of suffering and hunger. "I was literally starving," he writes, "and it is simply terrible to think what an appetite I then had. I remember once playing at cards with some students almost as poor as myself, and winning a shilling, with which I bought some rolls. I do not recollect how many my two friends ate, but I know I devoured all they left." As we might expect, he soon got into debt for the damp, ill-furnished room he rented from an old soldier, and returning late one cold autumn night was refused admittance and locked out. For hours the homeless lad wandered along the streets, his thin and well-worn cloak affording but a sorry protection against the wind and snow, till, overcome with fatigue and hunger, he sank down on the doorstep of a shop. At that late hour the street was deserted and lonely, but suddenly approaching steps were heard, and looking up he saw a beggarman and boy. The latter had already begun in a whining tone the form of prayer for charity usual with Russian mendicants—"For the sake of Christ"—when, seeing that Nekrasoff was half-frozen to death, the man offered to find him a shelter for the night. They accordingly brought him to a beggars' haunt in the purlieus of the city. It was a large room, dimly lighted with two tallow candles that just made the darkness visible, and round a long table in the centre were gathered some twenty or thirty men and women drinking and smoking. "There is a scholar we have picked up that has no home," said his host by way of introducing him to the company, "so give him some *vodki*." One of the beggars, an old woman, arranged a mattress in a corner of the room, covered him up with a blanket, and placed a greasy but soft pillow under his head. He soon fell fast asleep, and on awaking late in the morning found himself alone with his good friend. She came up to him and said, "Write out a paper for me that I want, or else I shall get into trouble with the police." He did so, and she insisted on his taking threepence for his pains. And with this modest sum he had to begin life again as best he could.

In the meanwhile the time had come when he must pass the entrance examination at the university. Unfortunately, he failed in one of the subjects he had to take up, and but for the kindly interference of M. Pletnieff, the rector, the privations endured for the sake of being admitted as a university student would have been in vain. It was no easy task to provide the customary fees, or to find rent money for the humble lodging that he took in one of the shabbiest and most distant quarters of the town. But he struggled bravely

on, and allowed no difficulties to daunt him. "I swore to myself," are his confident words, "that I would never die in a garret." The vow was more than kept, and after years of hard persistent work he reaped his long-delayed reward :—

"The evening stars shone dimly,
The winds blew loud and the heavy rain poured down,
As I bade a last adieu to my country home,
And set out for the far distant capital.

"In my hand I bore a long thick staff,
On my shoulder hung the well-nigh empty wallet,
On my back an old sheepskin fur,
And in my pocket just—fifteen pence.

"Without money, rank, or title,
Little in stature, ungainly in feature !
Since then forty years have gone by,
And now in my pocket is—a million ! "

At first, of course, he was only too glad to accept any drudging occupation in the shape of correcting for the press or giving lessons ; but by contributing several compositions in verse to one or two of the metropolitan monthlies, he soon got introduced into the literary circle at Petersburg and Moscow. In 1840 Nekrasoff published a small volume, consisting for the most part of poems that had already appeared in *The Annals of the Country* and other journals, under the general title of *Dreams and Echoes*. Though favourably received by Foukovski, the poet, and by some of the best reviewers, they were severely criticised by Belinski, who curtly declared that "the only impression they could produce on the mind of a reader was that mediocrity in a poet is an unpardonable defect." We may suppose that Nekrasoff himself acquiesced in the justice of this verdict, for he carefully withdrew the volume from sale, and it was long a literary rarity, though since his death these poems have been included in the last collected edition of his works. Four years later a far more important venture was made by the unsuccessful poet in the publication of *The Petersburg Album*, a collection of tales, poems, and articles by different writers. The *Album* must ever possess a peculiar interest from the fact that Dostoevski, the noble-hearted champion of the suffering and poor, and whose sudden death all Russia but a few months ago mourned as a national loss, contributed to its pages *Poor People*, the first of his novels. In an autobiographical sketch, published in 1877, the year of Nekrasoff's death, Dostoevski has related the story of his first introduction to the poet. "When I had finished my first novel, *Poor People*, I did not know what to do with it, or to whom to send it. I had not a literary acquaintance, unless, indeed, it were Grigorovitch, and the only thing he had ever written was a short sketch published in one of the magazines. At that time he was living in the same rooms with Nekrasoff. One evening we

were together, when he said to me, 'Bring your manuscript (which, by the way, he had never read); 'Nekrasoff thinks of publishing an annual, and I will show it to him.' I took it, saw Nekrasoff, but was so confused and agitated that, after having shaken hands and exchanged a word or two, I hurried home. That evening I went to see a friend, and we sat for hours talking about Gogol's *Dead Souls*, and reading our favourite passages, I suppose, for the hundredth time. It was already four o'clock when I reached home—a bright clear night, as light as day, a real Petersburg night. All at once I heard a loud ring of the bell, and on opening the door, Nekrasoff and Grigorovitch rushed in, both in a state of indescribable excitement. It appeared that early in the evening they had begun reading my tale—read ten pages. Nekrasoff said, 'That will be enough.' But when they had finished ten they decided to read just ten more, and so they passed the whole night, one relieving the other when he got tired, like sentinels at a post. When they came to the scene of the student's death, Nekrasoff more than once completely broke down, and, suddenly striking the table, exclaimed, 'That is genius!' At last the reading came to an end, and then they agreed to set off immediately for my rooms. 'What does it matter if he be asleep?' cried Nekrasoff. 'We will wake him; that is better than any sleep!'" From that day a friendship that soon ripened into close intimacy was formed between the two young writers, and of the many tributes paid to Nekrasoff's memory none was inspired with a heartier love or more genuine warmth than the few words pronounced by Dostoevski over his grave.

The story of the remaining years of the poet's life may be briefly related. His studies at the university were interrupted, in order that he might devote himself exclusively to a literary career. He became editor of *The Contemporary* and of *The Annals of the Country*, two journals that, under his direction, soon secured a high and enviable position in the periodical literature of Russia. The former was some years ago suppressed in consequence of Tchernitchevski's novel, *What is to be done now?* But the latter, under the editorship of M. Kraevski, still continues to be the organ of the Russian Liberal party. With all the energy natural to his character Nekrasoff threw himself heart and soul into the work, sparing neither time nor labour in the advocacy of those radical reforms of which his country still stands in such need. To use his own words:—

"The years of my youth, the pleasant spring of life,
Were weighted with the heavy burden of unrespired work,
Nor was I ever the spoiled pet of ease or the friend of sloth."

But the privations of his earlier days could not fail in the end to tell

upon a constitution that at its best was never robust, and these years of excessive labour, followed by a short period of reckless abandonment to pleasure, marked by his wonted indifference to prudence or moderation, served completely to ruin his health. The last three years of his life were passed in uninterrupted pain ; but even when most ill he would crawl from his bed and spend an hour or two each day in reading and dictating verses of his own composition. "I am so ill," he writes to a Moscow friend a few months before his death, "that I can no longer work, and find it difficult even to think. All I can send you to-day are the following four lines *On a Portrait* :—

"Thy claim to glory is but fragile,
And if we deduct from thy rare triumphs
The errors of thy youth, the weaknesses of later years,
This, dear friend, must be thy epitaph :—I have failed !"

"You will see," he adds in a postscript, "the lines are applicable to most of us, myself among the number." As we read this and similar expressions of a fear, wrung from him by long and torturing pain, lest he should have failed in the work of his life, we turn to his poems, and in the wide, large-hearted sympathy for the poor, and in the passionate devotion to his country with which they are inspired, we find the full and complete expiation of any errors and shortcomings that may have darkened more than one scene in his wild and chequered life. The task he had set himself on entering the world he had nobly fulfilled; and thereby won the loving homage paid to his memory by the crowd of mourners, composed for the most part of young students, who followed to the grave the poet who had done more than any of his contemporaries to awaken his country to a consciousness of the strength she possessed in the untried energies of her despised and enslaved people, and to hasten the day when their right to freedom should be acknowledged.

In order to understand the position which Nekrasoff occupies in contemporary Russian literature, we should remember that whilst one class of writers, chiefly represented by Polonski, the poet, and Count Tolstoi, the dramatist, have maintained the Poushkin conception of poetry, and are artistic idealists, another and far more numerous group, composed of writers like Goncharoff, Tourgenieff, Dostoevski, and Tolstoi, the novelist, are the immediate followers of Gogol in their portrayal of humanity as it is, and in the pictures they give of common daily life. They have brought poetry down from heaven, and made it the echo, not of the fantastical, but of the real. "The real hero of my tales," writes Tolstoi, "is truth ;" and the same may be said of Nekrasoff, who is essentially the poet of the people. The life of the peasant, his toil, vexations, distresses, faults, weaknesses, and rare joys, form the theme of his best poems. They

describe to us the vice and misery which he himself had witnessed and partly felt in his youth, and they are completely free from those "tinsel trappings" of style poets generally employ to adorn and set off their pictures. His poetry is of this world, unmixed with the purely ideal or imaginary, and his music, to use his own expression, is "the fellow-friend of the wretched poor born to strife, suffering, and toil." In these words we have the crowning characteristic of Nekrasoff's poetry. Others had before him, from time to time, denounced serfdom, condescendingly pitied the hard fate of the *mozjik*, and even prophesied the day "when slavery should disappear at the nod of the Tsar;" but their verse lacks too often that touch of reality which nothing but actual experience can give; they write as outsiders, and occupy towards the people much the same position as the actor in *Hamlet* does to Hecuba, whose woes he none the less so passionately declaims. Nekrasoff, on the contrary, is of, not above, the people; he does not write about them, but he feels with them, and their belief, hopes, and griefs are his own. It is this dominant trait which has gained for his poems such a marvellous popularity; nor need we find any difficulty in attaching credit to the story related by his biographer, how one of the speeches delivered on the day of his funeral, in which a comparison was drawn between Nekrasoff and Poushkin, was interrupted by loud cries of "Greater! greater!" Of course no comparison can really be made between the two; but the anecdote well explains the origin of the strong hold which Nekrasoff has secured on the mind and sympathy of the youth of Russia.

Some of Nekrasoff's critics have been pleased to censure his poems for their tone of monotonous gloom. But is not this rather the highest tribute that can be paid to the truthfulness with which they reflect the unrelieved gloom of that life of serfdom to which, for so many generations, the peasantry of Russia were pitilessly condemned? And when these critics proceed to contrast Nekrasoff with poets like Burns, we can only urge that such comparisons are idle and inappropriate. The conditions of life surrounding them were radically different, and it is only natural if the outcome of their experiences, the impressions produced on them by all they felt and witnessed, should be equally opposed. The gaiety of a Burns would be strangely misplaced in pictures of a life whose lightest songs are coloured with a tinge of melancholy. To a foreigner, and to one ignorant of the actual condition of the Russian peasant prior to his emancipation, there may seem something exaggerated and affected in the sombre tone of Nekrasoff's poems; but, in reality, which of us has ever listened to the wailing, plaintive songs chanted by the labourer at his work, without recalling those lines in which the poet has so sadly seized on their true signification—

"I am on the Volga: what groan echoes
O'er the waters of the great Russian river?
That groan with us is called a song."

In one of his most characteristic poems, Nekrasoff has given us a portrait, "drawn at full length as in a picture," of the typical Ivan, as he stands before his master, unwashed, silent, and unkempt, everlastingly half drunk, with tattered clothes, and boots innocent of blacking and down at heel, his favourite pipe and greasy tobacco-pouch leering out of his pocket. Neither he nor any of his forefathers have ever boasted of a home of their own; nor has he been brought up to any one particular trade, but "is sempstress, cook, and carpenter all in one," and does any job to which he is set, or if he fails is sworn at and well beaten. One day Ivan is nowhere to be found, having sneaked off to pass a merry night with his friend the publican, who was "also a secret purloiner of the squire's turkeys and fowls." Careless of what may come, Ivan gives himself up heart and soul that night to the dance, so that "every limb and joint and the very ring in his right ear danced madly for joy," and he became for a few hours completely oblivious of the ills of life.

"In the morning he is called before his lord:
Where have you been skulking since yesterday?
I? nowhere: before God: it is true,
I have been standing at the gate.
What, all night long? And then came rude equivocations,
Stupid, manifest, and patent lies.
If he had teeth,—one or two were knocked down his throat;
If he had none,—his ears half twisted off.
Pardon, pardon! cries with whining voice Ivan.
Go, idiot, and roast a goose for dinner,
And see the cabbage-soup is well prepared!"

And then, another day, poor Ivan is again summoned before his master. In his drunken fear, his mind is dazed as to what new offence is going to be brought up against him, but to his surprise "liberty had come," and he is allowed to go whither he likes:—

"And lost among the enfranchised people
Our Ivan suddenly disappears:
How dost thou live in thy new-won liberty?
Where art thou? Eh? Ivan?"

"How dost thou live in thy new-won liberty?" is a question most of us have asked, and I think there is to be found in the poems written by Nekrasoff subsequently to the year 1861 an answer, which recommends itself the more because unfounded on the wild dreams of enthusiasts who imagined that, once the edict of emancipation was signed, the work of reform was finally accomplished. "To redress the wrongs of centuries," he warns us, "is no easy task;" and there is a wise moderation in the joy he feels at the thought that henceforth the peasant is free to choose his work and lot in life:—

"If thou wilt—remain a *moujik* all thy life,
 If thou canst—soar to heaven with an eagle's flight!
 Many of our fondest hopes will be deceived:
 The mind of man is cunning and inventive,
 I know: and in the place of slavery chains
 Men will easily forgo a hundred others:
 So be it: but the people shall have strength to break them,
 And my muse with hope salutes the dawn of liberty."

And if, besides the ills that in every country are the heritage of the poor, serfdom left behind it traces not soon or easily to be removed, still with the restoration of liberty labour acquired a dignity it had never enjoyed before, and the peasant has begun to take pride in his work, and the rough brutality of a coarse age has yielded to a kindlier sympathy towards those for whom and with whom he toils. It is this feeling which Nekrasoff has so well interpreted in the most finished of all his shorter poems, "Home from Work;" and I would fain hope that the "tone of sober truth" which characterizes the original, and won for it the special praise of a critic like Tourgenieff, has not altogether been lost in the following close and word for word translation:—

"Good evening, wife! Good evening, little ones!
 Bring out the liquor! Eh, what a frost has set in!
 You have, then, forgotten how you drained the last bottle quite,
 When the tithe-collector called to see us.—Well no great trouble!

"A poor sinner can warm himself even if he has no spirit:
 But tell me, you looked to the horse, wife, well,
 For in the spring the bonny beast was nigh starved,
 When the hay began to fail.

"Eh, I am dead with fatigue. . . . Well, you have seen to the horse?
 So now, give me something warm to eat.
 I have not been able, darling, to heat the stove to-day,
 For, you know, the wood has run out.

"Well a poor sinner can warm himself without soup:
 But you have given our horse a good feed of oats,
 For it was he alone that helped us the summer through,
 And the brave beast worked hard in our four fields.

"And now, 'tis hard for us to drag the timber home,
 The roads are quite cut up. . . . How, is there not a morsel of bread.
 It is all finished, darling. I've sent to neighbours to ask for some,
 And they have promised to let us have a little by the dawn.

"Well, and a poor sinner can sleep even if he has no bread:
 But, wife, lay down some straw for the horse;
 Why, this very winter our bonny beast has drawn
 More than three hundred timber-rafts."

The best of Nekrasoff's poems, *Red Nosed Frost, To Whom is Life in Russia Worth Living*, and *Russian Women* were written in the rare leisure hours he could snatch from his heavy labours as journalist,

and editor. The first of these three, published in 1863, is dedicated to his favourite sister Anna, as "the last of my poems written for thee and inscribed to thee;" and its tone of melancholy is doubtless the result of the circumstances under which it was composed. The fearful disease from which he was to suffer so long then just declared itself, and more than once the doctors despaired of his life, and each poem he henceforth wrote was commenced with the presentiment it would be the last, and that he might not even be spared to conclude it. It opens with a brief but picturesque description of an old woman driving a sledge laden with a plain rude coffin in the midst of a blinding snowstorm. The vehicle stops at the door of a hut, and then we are introduced to Dora, the widowed heroine, in whom, with his wonted ease of style and simplicity of language, the poet has sympathisingly sketched the perfect type of a peasant wife:—

"In many a Russian hamlet we may find such women,
With quiet earnestness of face,
With a grace of strength in their every movement,
As they go by with royal gait and queenly look,
With beauty that even the blind may see,
And those who see it will mutter to themselves:
Such bring sunshine with them wherever they come."

Whilst the aged mother is busy arranging the coffin she has brought home from the neighbouring town, and whilst the old father is digging the grave in a spot "where the rays of the sun shall play around the cross surmounting it," Dora, too proud to shed a tear, works the shroud, as the wailers chant their wild requiem to the dead:—

"Whither, darling dove, with thy dark-blue wings
Hast thou flown so far away?
In manly beauty, in stature, and in strength,
In all the village thou hadst ne'er thy peer.

"To the sire thou wert a counsellor sage,
To the labourer in the field thou wert a helping mate,
To the guest thou gavest the bread and salt of welcome,
To wife and children thou gavest thy love.

"Wherefore didst thou make thy stay so short?
Wherefore hast thou, love, deserted us?
Thou didst reconsider thy first thought,
Thou didst reconsider with the damp cold earth,

"Thou didst reconsider, and ordained that we
Should remain orphaned in the world,
As we wash thee now, not with water fresh,
But with our hot and burning tears.

"The aged mother will die with weeping;
Thy father cannot live alone;
Like the forest-birch lopped of its tuft
Is the housewife in the house without her mate.

"But thou, wretched one, hast no pity for her,
No pity for thy children. . . . Awake, arise !
Then in the summer from thy father's plot of land
Thou canst reap the golden harvest fall.

"Food of our eyes ! unfold thy hands,
Look up with thy falcon glance,
Shake thy silken locks,
Open thy sweet mouth !

"Then for joy we would boil
The honey and strong drink,
Would seat thee at the table ;
Eat, longed for, and our darling !

"Then would we stand before thee,
Our bread-giver and hope of home,
Nor once take our eyes from off thee,
And would greedily devour thy sweet words."

The funeral over, Dora hurries home to prepare the meal for her young children, but finds that the last faggot has been burnt out, and though she fain would stay to rest, there is no time to idle or caress the little ones, and she at once sets off to the forest in search of wood with the same horse that had borne her husband to his last resting-place. And at the very moment when she is gathering her strength, and has already raised the axe to cut down a large pine-tree, from its topmost branch gleams forth the face of the dread frost-king. Whispering in her ear, "Art thou warm, fair one ?" he stretches out his ice-cold arms and clasps her tightly to his breast. Not a sound breaks the dead silence of the forest, when suddenly a hurried noise is heard as a squirrel leaps from bough to bough, and dislodges a mass of crusted snow that falls heavily on the woman's face, but she does not stir, wrapped as she is for ever in her frozen trance.

In a conversation with one of his friends during his last illness, Nekrasoff spoke of *To Whom is Life in Russia Worth Living* as his favourite poem and the work by which he hoped to be longest remembered. "If," he continued, "I could but have three or four years more of life ; for it can only be judged as a whole, and the farther I advance in it, the clearer is my idea of the way in which the action of the poem must be developed, with its new characters and new scenes. At first, I had no distinct notion how it should end, but now all is thought out, and I feel that the poem will gain more and more. But I fear I shall not live to finish it, for the hand of death is already on me." His fears unhappily proved to be too well founded, and the poem was never completed. By adopting the style, language, and metre of the old popular tales, the poet has forestalled any objection that might be raised on score of the improbability of the main incident on which the whole story turns.

Seven peasants engage in hot dispute as to who in Russia lives most happily and most at his ease: Roman says, the country proprietor; Damian selects the *tchinovnik*; Luke, the priest; the brothers Goubine vote for the "fat-paunched merchant;" Pachom fixes his choice on the minister of state; and Popoff declares for the Tzar. In defending the merits of their respective candidates, the disputants grow so eager and excited, that each forgets why he had set out from home or whither he is bound, and they wander on quarrelling and wrangling till they find themselves belated in a dark, thick forest. There an enchanted bird comes to their help, promises beforehand that their clothes shall not wear out and that a sufficient amount of food and drink shall be provided for them, makes them swear to cease fighting and to settle the question in dispute "reasonably and like men that fear God," and bids them set out on a pilgrimage to the most widely separated parts of the empire, in order that they may by comparing different lives be able to decide in what rank and calling true happiness is to be found. The plot would therefore have afforded the poet an opportunity of sketching the most varied phases of Russian life, but those portions of the work referring to the *tchinovnik*, the minister of state, and the Tzar were never completed, and its four cantos—the last of which, owing to vexatious interferences on the part of the censor, was only published in February of the present year—consequently treat of his favourite theme, the actual condition of the peasantry, and give a picture that has been challenged for its pessimist colouring by official critics, but which those who condemn most loudly are well aware is true in its every minutest detail. Of the different stories which make up the poem, the most striking is that of Ermile, to whom the pilgrims are on one occasion advised to apply, since he, better than any, will be able to decide who it is in Russia that lives happily and at his ease.

"And who may this Ermile be?
A prince, eh? an excellency, or a count?
Nor prince, nor excellency, nor count,
But simply a moujik—nothing more."

They are then informed how by a life of unswerving honesty he gained the confidence of his fellow peasants, and how their trust in him was so great that they once willingly collected and gave to him on loan a large sum of money to extricate him from a difficulty into which he had been brought by no fault of his own, but through the knavery of others. The pilgrims wonderingly ask "by what witchcraft" he succeeded in obtaining such an unwonted proof of sympathy and help, and are told, "it was by no witchcraft but by integrity alone," and that when the old earl died and the young heir called upon his serfs to choose from among themselves an overseer, they immediately and as one man elected Ermile. For years he governed

justly and in the fear of God, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left ; but once he allowed himself to be persuaded by his lord to falsify the recruiting list, and in place of the rightful candidate to substitute the son of Nenile Vassilievna. From that moment his conscience allowed him no rest or repose, and in spite of all remonstrances he compelled the village elders to assemble and to judge him for the offence of which he had been guilty—

“ And Ermilo Ilyitch came before us,
 Bareheaded, gaunt, with fettered feet,
 And hands bound tight with cords :
 He came and spake ;—Time was,
 When I judged you by the law of conscience,
 Now am I more guilty than you all :
 Judge me then, and pronounce your sentence on me.
 And low to our feet he bowed,
 The madman refused to give or take,
 But stood, as he groaned and crossed himself,
 And all were filled with pity to see him there,
 As suddenly he fell upon his knees
 Before Nenile Vassilievna.”

Through the influence of the earl all is arranged ; but though he thus escapes punishment the proud-hearted peasant feels humiliated, resigns the office he had betrayed, and expiating by long years of faithful service to the commune the injustice he had committed, wins, if possible, still more than he had done before the love and esteem of his fellow-serfs. And whilst the story of the good man is being related, one of the listeners interrupts the narrator—

“ Five years ago we were neighbours,
 Lived in the same village, and I knew him well.
 Verily, he was in heart and soul a true *monjik*.
 Justly he could claim all that brings a man
 Real happiness : a quiet conscience,
 Wealth, and honour :
 Honour, to be envied, sincere,
 Not bought with money,
 Or given in fear, but the prize
 Of strict integrity, wisdom, goodness.
 But still, I tell you once again,
 It is in vain you go to seek him out :
 He is, and long has been, a convict in the galleys.”

He is asked why, and, first answering like a true Russian peasant “ God willed it so,” reminds them of the serious riots that some years before broke out in the district where Ermile lived, and which for a while the severest measures on the part of the Government failed to suppress. The expedient to which the bewildered authorities in the end resorted is thoroughly characteristic of Russian rule. The troops are marched into the village, and the commander is on the point of ordering them to fire, when a happy idea strikes the district scribe, and he speaks to him of Ermile as one who had long possessed

the unlimited confidence of the people. "Call him hither, quick!" is the reply; and that same day poor Ermile, without trial and ignorant as to what crime he is accused of, is sent into exile for life.

Russian Women may serve as an answer to the accusation so often brought against Nekrasoff as poet, and to which I have already more than once referred. We are told that he grossly exaggerates the actual social and political condition of the Russian people, and that the misery in which he represent them to be sunk is an exceptional and not a general phenomenon. But these two poems, at least, are historically true; they are no creations of the fancy; and yet the story in both is as terribly sombre as any we can find in those of his poems which are avowedly fictitious. As we read these records of uninterrupted monotonous woe, of sufferings undeserved, and of the uncomplaining endurance with which men, whose only crime was they loved their country too well, bore the hideous horrors of Siberian exile, we ask with the heroine of the first of these poems—

"Tell me, is the whole country thus wretched?
Is there nowhere even the shadow of plenty and content?
Thou art now in the empire of beggars and of slaves,
Was the curt reply."

The two princes, Trubetskoi and Volkonski, are arrested on a vague suspicion of having been concerned in the December revolt of 1825, and, in accordance with the arbitrary administration of law then in fashion, are without trial exiled and condemned to work as convicts in the mines of Siberia. For a time their terrible fate is kept a profound secret even from their wives, but naturally all is soon discovered, and then the two women, brought up though they had been in delicacy and refinement, determined to follow their banished husbands. Application is made to the Emperor, without whose special consent they cannot carry out their brave resolution, and after some delay the permission is accorded in a letter written in elegant and polished French. It is only at Nerchinsk that they meet, and from this distant point together they front a journey the perils and dangers of which none save those who have made it can imagine. But undauntedly they pursue their way, till at length the goal of their seven months' weary wanderings is attained, and the last dangers of the dark mine in which those dearest to them are doomed to work are encountered with the same brave spirit that had sustained them through all their pilgrimage of devoted love—

"And then I heard a voice cry, He is coming! he is coming!
And, as I peered eagerly into the distance,
I darted forth, and nearly fell
Into a deep canal that stretched before us;
But Trubetskoi seized my hand and held me back;
With careful haste Serge approached,
And at each step his chains clanked dismally.

The crowd of workmen and their soldier guards
 Made way before us, and a dead silence reigned around,
 And then he saw me, then he saw me,
 And stretching out his hands exclaimed, Mario !
 And stood, his whole strength failing him, silent and far off,
 Two brother exiles rushed to him and held him up.
 Large warm tears flowed down his death-pale cheeks,
 And his stretched-out hands shook convulsively.
 That same moment the sound of his sweet voice
 Filled my soul with fresh strength,
 With joy, hope, forgetfulness of all past sorrow,
 And with the cry, I am here ! I running ran,
 As I hurriedly broke from the hand that still held me back,
 And darted along the plank that bridged the wide canal,
 To meet the fond voice that once more called me to his side,
 I am here ! A bright smile of welcome gleamed over
 His worn sunken features, and was the solo reply.
 I am here ! And a strange feeling of holy joy possessed me.
 Only now, in those fatal mines,
 My ears filled with hideous sounds of woe,
 My eyes riveted to the chains my husband wore,
 Only now, I comprehended what his sufferings were,
 What his strength, and how great his power to endure ;
 Scarcely knowing what I did, I bent the knee before him,
 And, ere he could raise me from the ground,
 Pressed my lips to his chains and kissed them."

In one of his latest poems, written but a few weeks before his death, Nekrasoff speaks of his muse as being weak in tone and powerless to move, and proudly anticipates the advent of the true poet, the two heroes of whose song shall be the Tsar, destroyer of the inequalities of centuries, and the peasant, in whom the nation shall recognise the source and guardian of imperial power. This unity of interest and tie of mutual responsibility between ruler and ruled forms the central idea of Nekrasoff's poetry. More than any other poet, he has taught the present generation what the work is they have to accomplish ; and it is for this reason that his writings possess such a peculiar worth to the student of contemporary Russian life.

CHARLES EDWARD TURNER.

“THE DRY BONES OF POPULAR EDUCATION.”

A REPLY.

THERE are two distinct issues raised in Miss Christie's article with the above title in the last number of the *Fortnightly Review*. The one is, whether the production of reading books for elementary schools should be left as hitherto to the private enterprise of book-makers and publishers, or should be undertaken by the Education Department, with the effect, of course, of compelling all State-aided schools to use the books prescribed by the State, and no others. The second issue is, whether reading books, no matter how produced or provided, should consist, as at present they mainly do, of interesting narrative, useful information, and standard poetry, or of what is called pure literature. There is no necessary connection between these two questions. They are capable of quite independent discussion, and those who may agree with Miss Christie in her answer to the former question may at the same time differ entirely from her in her answer to the second, and *vice versa*. Miss Christie, however, has chosen to mingle the issues and to interweave her conclusions. She is of opinion that the State ought to authorise and to prescribe the reading books. She is also of opinion that the reading books should consist of what she calls “real literature,” and should exclude everything else. We need not affect surprise at Miss Christie having mixed up these proposals, for we are quite certain that she cannot have the slightest hope of carrying out her second proposal without her first. There is not the smallest chance, we mean to say, of such a set of readers as Miss Christie has projected and described ever being generally adopted in elementary schools unless the Education Department shall compel the schools to use them. Without the faintest wish to be uncharitable, we venture to think that Miss Christie is herself well aware of this, and to suggest that that has been her reason for combining the two proposals and for making them interdependent.

If there appear to be good reasons for Miss Christie mixing up these proposals, there are equally good reasons for our desiring to keep them separate. The proposal of a uniform series of official readers is not one on which we are likely to be credited with giving an unbiassed opinion. We are of the number of “book-makers and publishers,” of whom Miss Christie writes with so little respect. We cannot therefore speak, at least we shall not get credit for speaking, on this part of the subject with the high disinterestedness of philanthropists and lovers of education for its own sake. We may,

nevertheless, be allowed to suggest to those persons (they are not likely to be practical educationists) who may possibly be found in agreement with Miss Christie on this point, that that "private enterprise" for which she has so much scorn has done something to improve the educational literature of this country during recent years. Let any one place side by side the books from which children are now taught in elementary schools and the books which their grandfathers, or even their fathers, used, and it will be impossible for him to come to any other conclusion than that immense improvements have been made both in the matter and in the appearance of the books. These improvements are due to "private enterprise," and to nothing else. If having to read and to spell is less a weariness of the flesh to our children than it was to our fathers, and even to ourselves, to what but to "speculation by book-makers and publishers" do we owe the happy change?

We in England may learn something from Scotland in this particular; and the illustration is the more striking because that country has always held a foremost place among European nations in the matter of popular education. A Scottish clergyman has just published his "reminiscences of seventy years." In his interesting picture of the parochial schools as they were half a century ago, he says, "At the time I speak of [about 1826] there was no reading book for the more advanced classes but the Bible; none for the younger classes but selections from the Book of Proverbs; and none for beginners but the alphabet, and syllables of two or three letters printed on an outer leaf of the Shorter Catechism."¹ Those who are familiar with the history of education do not need to be told that this was no exceptional case. It was the rule in Scotland at a time when Scotland was still more decidedly ahead of England in the provision of popular education than is the case now. And surely no one can honestly compare the state of matters here described with that which now exists—when there are not only interesting and attractive reading books in abundance, and suited to every kind of taste except that represented by Miss Christie, but also educational appliances of endless variety in the shape of wall-sheets, of home-lesson books, of pictures and diagrams and reading frames—without admitting that "the dry bones of popular education," as they formerly existed, have been breathed upon to some purpose, and have become "an exceeding great army," which is effectively doing battle with ignorance and coarseness and vice.

Now this wonderful transformation has been the work, not of a Government department, and not of artificial forcing, but of "private enterprise" and open competition. Just because the production of school books has been made "an affair of speculation by

1) Dr. William Paul's *Past and Present of Aberdeenshire*.

book-makers and publishers," the improvement in the style and character of the books has been continuous as well as rapid. The principle of competition has had full play. It has been the interest of every one engaged in the work to secure public favour by striving to produce a better article than his predecessors had produced. It is amazing that any one in these days—especially that one so much interested in education as the writer of the article evidently is—should be insensible to the immense advantages which school-book literature has derived from the competition of publishing houses, and from the ever-quickenened ingenuity of rival editors. Indeed, we are tempted to ask whether the writer has had much experience either of the kind of literature which she essays to criticise, or of the class of schools or of children to whose wants and capacities that literature is adapted.

Hardly any feature of the case is more remarkable than the improvement that has taken place in text-books of history, even during the ten years to which Miss Christie refers. In place of dense and repulsive pages crowded with facts, dates, and proper names, we have bright and picturesque narrative, and we have books studded with sketch-maps, plans of battle-fields, portraits of great men, and spirited pictures of famous scenes. And all this is the result of the competition of "private enterprise." Free trade in school-books, like free trade generally, is a thoroughly healthy system. It secures progressive improvement and adaptation to the ever-changing wants of successive periods. At one and the same time it forces quality upwards and it keeps down price. That which is in the first instance merely a matter of trade rivalry, results in intellectual vitality from which the public derives great gain.

One of the chief recommendations of the system is that practically and in the long run it gives the workman command of a variety of tools, and leaves him free to select the tools best suited at once to his hand and to his work. We are quite certain that an order issued by the Education Department for the use of an official set of readers all over England would be received with dismay and would produce disaster. The Education Department deals only with results and with the conditions that make results trustworthy. It wisely leaves the selection of the means by which the results may be attained to the responsible authorities, that is to the schoolmasters and the managers of the schools.

Any one who wishes to see the effect of requiring the use of official school-books has only to look at the case of Ireland. There, for special reasons which are well known, it was thought advisable to issue a set of books sanctioned by the National Commissioners, and to prohibit the use of other books in the national schools. These books contain much excellent matter. When they were compiled

they were exceptionally good. But they were long ago surpassed by the efforts of English and Scottish editors and publishers. The progressive improvement secured by competition and "private enterprise" has been altogether wanting. Irishmen complain that their books are completely antiquated, and are a hindrance rather than a help to the attainment of good results. The *Royal Readers* and others of the same class may be "dry bones" in the estimation of Miss Christie, but they are very enticing flesh and blood in the eyes of the Irish National schoolmasters, who for many months past have been agitating earnestly for leave to use the very books which Miss Christie condemns.

Miss Christie's second proposal—to supersede the modern general readers by books of "real literature"—is one with which we can legitimately deal. It is one on which we have some right to be heard, as our books have been selected as the typical modern readers. Nay, more, it is one on which, for that very reason, the editors and publishers of other series will naturally expect us to speak out on their behalf, as well as on our own. The publication of such a proposal in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* gives it a degree of importance which, in our opinion, and we doubt not in the opinion of many others affected by it, it does not in itself possess. This also makes it desirable that what we conceive to be the fallacies of the article should be exposed in the same organ in which they have been promulgated. The prominence given to the *Royal Readers* in the paper is our only reason for undertaking to reply to it. We wish it to be clearly understood, at the same time, that we do not write for the purpose of defending the *Royal Readers* in particular. Though our books are attacked, we understand that they are attacked in their representative character. Our reply will also be representative. We shall presume to make common cause with our friendly rivals. We shall speak, therefore, only of the principle which has been assailed—a principle common to them and us—and not at all of the detailed criticisms which apply to our books only.

We feel bound, at the same time, to acknowledge the compliment implied in the selection of the *Royal Readers* as the typical series, even though that has been done for the purpose of attack and condemnation. They were the first series of Readers compiled after the passing of the Act of 1870, and nearly all the series published subsequently have followed their distinctive features, and have imitated their style with a faithfulness by which we cannot but be flattered. Miss Christie of course thinks that they have radical and fatal faults; but it is something worth acknowledgment to have them characterized by an adverse critic as "the set which is pronounced best by the almost unanimous verdict of the school inspectors, and which, I am told, is most widely used." In proportion as this praise

is high is the responsibility which it implies great. If the reading and the intelligence of the children in the elementary schools of England and Scotland have deteriorated during the last decade, we must be prepared to bear a large share of the blame. We have no reason, however, to shrink from the application of this test. According to "the almost unanimous verdict of the school inspectors," and according to the published reports of the Education Department, both the style of reading and the general intelligence of the scholars in elementary schools have improved greatly during the last ten years. While it may be admitted that this fortunate result is due mainly to the care and skill and energy of the school teachers, it is impossible to deny at least a share of the credit to the reading books which they have used. From this it is safe to infer that the *Royal Readers* and the other sets of readers of the same kind have at least served some good purpose. They are tools of which the successful workmen need not be ashamed.

Miss Christie's first objection to the modern style of readers is of a very sweeping character. It rests on the universal and unqualified "incompetence" of the compilers. "Already," she says, "the Council of Education"—by which she means the Education Department—"directs in principle, but its direction is rendered valueless by the incompetence of those who obey." We might feel the thrust keenly if we did not know that we are condemned in excellent company. Unhappily for ourselves we are ignorant of the grounds of Miss Christie's claim to be the thorough-going censor of the compilers of modern reading books. As the editors of the series which she has singled out for special condemnation, we ought to be sunk in the depths of humiliation; but it is some consolation to know that we share her censure with several dignitaries of the Church, with professors of education and inspectors of schools, and with the principals of the leading training colleges both in England and Scotland. When we remember that we have been condemned as the editors of the "best" and the "most widely used" set of readers, and are presumably not inferior to other editors who have high-sounding titles and hold positions of eminence, our humility is increased rather than diminished. Miss Christie tells us that the production of school books requires "a certain amount of scholarship" and a great deal of "general culture," besides "sympathy with children and practical experience of the drudgery of teaching them;" and she leads us to believe that we and all the other editors are entirely destitute of these qualifications. Far be it from us to say that this is not the case; but we are content to appeal from the verdict of Miss Christie to the verdict of public opinion and to the facts of the case. We are only the editors of the *Royal Readers*, and have no other title to fame. But our critic ought

to know that there are reading books very similar to ours in plan and style, edited by the Rev. Evan Daniel, Principal of the Battersea Training College, and Member of the School Board for London; the Rev. J. P. Faunthorpe, Principal of the Whitelands Training College; Thomas Morrison, LL.D., Principal of the Free Church Training College, Glasgow; J. M. D. Meiklejohn, Professor of Education in the University of St. Andrews; Maurice Paterson, M.A., Principal of Moray House Training College, Edinburgh; Canon Ridgway, Principal of the Culham Training College; Canon Cromwell, Principal of St. Mark's Training College, Chelsea; the Rev. C. S. Dawe, Normal Master in the same College; and James S. Lauric, late one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. Among other compilers and editors who might have been referred to, and who are covered by our critic's condemnation, are "An Inspector of Schools" and several elementary and secondary teachers of good standing and wide experience. But the gentlemen named may suffice to indicate the character and the status of the "book-makers" whose "incompetence" is vitiating the wholesome efforts of the Education Department. Such are the men who have had the misfortune to incur Miss Christie's censure on account of their deficiency in the "scholarship," the "culture," the "sympathy with children," and the "practical experience" which are requisite for the production of a set of reading books for children in elementary schools. For ten years the scholastic world has been putting faith in these guides. But it seems that it has been utterly mistaken. Its old favourites are only base pretenders, from whom it is asked to withdraw its allegiance, and to transfer it to the apostle of "real literature."

The compilers of modern reading books being utterly "incompetent," in Miss Christie's estimation, it is not surprising that she finds the books themselves worthless. Her chief objection to them—apart from their uniform tone of "very inferior culture," due, of course, to their unscholarly and uncultured editors—is that they do not "store the mind with ideas worth remembering through life," that they leave the children who use them "outside the pale of cultivated conversation," so that they are "unable to use the current coin of intelligent society." The books "contain too much matter and touch upon too many subjects," and hence the lessons are characterized by "frivolity" and "inconsequence."

Miss Christie, therefore, proposes to abolish books of miscellaneous lessons—stories, literary readings in prose and verse, chapters of useful information—and to put in their place books of what she calls "real literature." Her model reading books, be it observed, are not to be like the literary reading books, of which some good examples at present exist. A collection of extracts, Miss Christie

argues, is not a "book," any more than the yearly volume of a magazine is a "book," in the true literary sense. It may be called a volume, but it is in fact merely a bundle of papers. Byron has said that "A book's a book, although there's nothing in't;" but, according to Miss Christie, a book isn't a "book" when it contains more things than one. To tell a child of eight years that the *First Royal Reader* is a "book" is to implant in its tender mind a literary falsehood. Miss Christie, therefore, insists that each reader in the series, from the first to the sixth, shall have the unity as well as the pure flavour of a distinct literary work—shall be a "book" in the sense in which the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Wealth of Nations* are books. She would relegate poetical pieces, whether for reading or for repetition, to what she calls the "Learning Book," which would also contain all the grammar and geography the children required, "reduced to strings of questions and answers." The only other subject allowed in elementary schools would be history, which would be taught in a set of special readers. There would thus be at most only three books for each class or standard—a book of "real literature," a book of history, and a Learning Book, containing tables, poetry, and catechisms of grammar and geography.

The Literary Book is the essential feature in this proposal—the feature which raises the main issue of Miss Christie's paper. That issue, as any one may see, is simply a new phase of the old controversy between the votaries of literature and the votaries of science. The novelties in the scheme are, first, its uncompromising hostility to science as a means of culture, involving its complete exclusion from the school course; and, second, its application of pure literature as the sole instrument of culture to every stage and age, from the child of seven to the boy or girl of fifteen. The latter proposal, we believe, will be condemned by the great mass of practical teachers. We say nothing at present of the absurdity, as it seems to us, of connecting "the pale of cultivated conversation" and "the current coin of intelligent society" with nine-tenths of the children that are found in Board schools and other elementary schools. We wish to speak in the first place simply of the practical effect of the proposed change on school work and school life.

Miss Christie proposes to keep the children of Standard I. working for a whole year at *Æsop's Fables*, and at nothing else. The prospect of such a course, we should think, would be sufficiently alarming to the teachers, and to the children the retrospect at the end of the year would be painful in the extreme. However much children may delight in fables, it can hardly be doubted that an unbroken course of fables extending from day to day over weeks and months would become unspeakably tiresome. An occasional fable in the midst of other lessons is a welcome change, but perpetual fable could

not fail to nauseate. It would be interesting to observe the demeanour of a First Standard class in the fourth month, say, of their unbroken round of "The Fox and the Crow," "The Fox and the Stork," "The Fox and the Grapes," "The Fox and the Goat," "The Fox and the Tiger," "The Fox and the Lion," "The Fox in the Well," "The Wolf and the Lamb," "The Wolf and the Crane," "The Wolf and the Kid," "The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing," and so on. We should be much mistaken if their lack-lustre eyes did not tell a sorrowful tale of flesh wearied and intelligence congested. It would hardly console them in their trouble if these children of seven and eight years of age—mere babes and sucklings in knowledge—were to be told that "The Fables of Æsop are among the classical things of knowledge;" that "the ideas embodied in them are part of that common stock of culture which it is desirable to make known to everybody;" that they are being fitted to walk within "the pale of cultivated conversation," or that they are being furnished with "the current coin of intelligent society."

When we think of the amount of labour which is involved in the thorough getting up of every day's lesson so as to satisfy the inspector at the end of the year, we are amazed that any one who knows what school work is and what school inspection implies should ever have thought of suggesting the slow torture that this proposal would entail, alike on scholars and on teachers. Learning to read in the first standard of an elementary school does not mean merely skimming the surface of a pleasant story. Nearly every word in each day's lesson has to be learned before it is read, and has to be read oftener than once before the lesson can be understood, and before the teacher can be sure of the children standing the inspector's test, not only for reading but also for spelling and intelligence. If Miss Christie knows these things she has shown very slight appreciation of the actual difficulties in the suggestions she has made.

These difficulties are so great, and the consequences of failure to surmount them are so serious, that both teachers and scholars need every help that can possibly be afforded them. One help certainly is to present the reading lessons in the language of children. Another help is to make the lessons deal with matters in which children are likely to be interested, not once, but continuously from day to day. To this latter end we hold variety of subjects to be indispensable. That variety, or rather multiplicity, of matters which Miss Christie condemns is a distinct advantage. The novelty which each day brings gives zest to each day's work. All that is requisite is that each lesson should be complete in itself, and should give sufficient work for the class and for the time which the lesson occupies.

For the Second Standard Miss Christie proposes a book of fairy

stories from Grimm, from the Arabian Nights, and from Hans Andersen. This proposal is liable to the same objections as that of *Æsop's Fables* for Standard I. The delight which children take in fairy tales is undoubted. It has not been left for Miss Christie to discover this, inasmuch as such stories, many of them from the standard sources specified by her, are found scattered through the series of books which she condemns. Even the grand end which Miss Christie has in view—that of familiarizing young people with the heroes and heroines of romance—may be quite successfully attained in that way. Fairy stories, like fables, are very good reading for children, if judiciously mingled with other fare; but to compel children to feed on fairy stories, and on them alone, for a whole year, could hardly fail to cause their taste for romance to pall, and to produce a sickening and depressing monotony.

Miss Christie's scheme for the Third Standard is even more startling than the proposals already referred to. Here her book of “real literature” is to be a “Gallery of Heroes.” She tells us that her “every suggestion is based upon experience of the attraction for children possessed by the character in the story;” but we may be allowed to doubt whether her experience has been acquired either in elementary schools or among the children that attend them. The normal age for children in this standard is between nine and ten years. The course of reading which Miss Christie desires to prescribe for them is to consist of, or at least to include, accounts of “the typical deliverers of mankind,” and in doing so she fancies that she is delivering the children from “the dry bones of popular education.” A prominent feature in the book for this standard which Miss Christie condemns is a series of stories of animals—the elephant, the tiger, the dog. These, however, are to be cast out as unprofitable servants, and instead, the innocent little urchins are to be told about “the mythical Prometheus, and Hercules, and Perseus.” Our censor rejects such useful and interesting information—lessons as “The Tea Farmer,” “Houses made of Snow,” “The Busy Little Lapp,” “Whale Hunting,” “A Beaver Town,” and “Raleigh's Two Plants,” and suggests in their stead a series of encyclopædic articles (for Standard III., be it remembered; ages nine and ten) on “the philosophers—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle;” yet she seems to be utterly unconscious of any suspicion that to children who are crying for bread she may be offering a stone. In like manner she deems it vicious and wasteful to tell our future artisans anything whatever about “The West India Islands,” about “The Habits of Flowers,” about “The Parrot,” or about “The Trunk of the Elephant,” but of the greatest moment to inform them, even before they are ten years old, about “the founders of the great religions of the world—Zoroaster, Bouddha, Mahomet.” A place, too, is found for “the patron

saints of Christendom," for "St. George, St. Michael, St. Christopher, St. Nicholas;" also for "the great female saints, Catherine, Cecilia, Ursula, Margaret;" and even for "the fathers of the Christian Church, the founders of the monastic orders." These serious and soul-exercising articles, it may be presumed, are to supersede such trivial and "mildly interesting" narratives as those of "The Prince and the Judge," which tells how Judge Gascoigne rebuked the impertinence of Henry V. when a young man, and "The Heroic Daughter," which reproduces in a condensed form the trials of Elizabeth, the daughter of the Siberian exile. Poor little souls, one may surely say of the Third Standard children, who are asked to exchange the whips of the uncultured editors of the *Royal Readers* for the scorpions with which Miss Christie would chastise them!

Miss Christie proposes to replace "the miscellaneous matter of the Fourth and Fifth Reading Books" by "something like a coherent account of ancient and modern literature." Her fourth book she would devote to "studies of Homer, Virgil, and Dante." We know of no book in "real literature" that answers to this description; but the field projected would probably be covered by the perusal of four or five volumes of the series of ancient and foreign *Classics for English Readers*. Interesting work this, we may suggest, for a boy or a girl in the Fourth Standard, and aged ten or eleven. In the same spirit of delicate appreciation of the tastes and wants of the working classes, the fifth book is to be devoted to "studies in English literature," the typical authors suggested being Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Johnson, and Scott. We make no objection to the authors selected; but the whole proposal seems to us extravagant. Any one who has ever attempted to use such authors as Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakespeare as school classics, must be quite well aware that the notion of familiarizing a class of school-boys or school-girls of twelve or thirteen years of age with the language and the ideas of any one of these authors in one-sixth of a year is an utterly ridiculous idea. The very shortest cut to this kind of knowledge would be found in mastering the relative volumes in the series of *English Men of Letters*. These volumes are hard enough reading for accomplished adults. What would they be for children far within their teens? The six volumes required for the year's work would comprise about 1,200 pages, and would cost fifteen shillings. Even if school-boards or school-managers could be induced to face the expense of the experiment, there is not the smallest reason to expect that the result would warrant the expenditure, or that the very poor play would be worth the very costly candle.

The chief objection, however, to the whole of Miss Christie's proposals remains to be stated. It is an objection not of detail, or of

practical experience, but an objection of principle; and it amounts simply to this, that the scheme mistakes radically and essentially what ought to be the main end of education, and especially of the popular education of the masses. She seems to think that the chief end of schooling for the working classes is to enable them to “take” the mythological allusions in current literature and to appreciate the classical pictures in the National Gallery. They may remain as ignorant as they please of the nature and origin of the things around them—of the cotton, or the iron, or the steel in which they are to work, of the bread they eat, of the tea and the coffee they drink, of glass and brick, of horses and sheep; but it is of supreme importance that they should know all about “The Mice in Council” and “The Mountain in Labour,” about Sinbad and Alladin, about Prometheus and Socrates, about St. Christopher and St. Ursula, and especially about Bouddha. And why? Because at some time or other in the course of their lives they may chance to meet with a reference to one or more of these subjects or heroes; and if they did not understand it they might ask, with Mr. Mallock, “Is life worth living?” for would they not feel themselves to be quite “outside the pale of cultivated conversation”? In some newspaper or magazine article that the children may read in after years, there may be an allusion to Hercules and the Carter, or to Mercury and the Woodman, or to the Ugly Duckling; therefore the children must get up all Æsop and all Grimm and Andersen. There is a chance of their one day listening to a lecture or a speech in which reference may be made to Aristotle and to Zoroaster; therefore the children must spend the best part of a year of their lives in getting up “the philosophers,” and also “the founders of the great religions of the world;” if they did not, they would be destitute of “the current coin of intelligent society,” and they must be saved from that degradation. Out of a Fourth Standard class of thirty boys in Cheshire or in Westmoreland, half-a-dozen may at some time go to London, and one of these may perhaps go to the National Gallery, and see Rubens’s “Judgment of Paris;” therefore all the thirty boys must devote a year to “studies of Homer, Virgil, and Dante.” In short, the standard of school acquirement is to be determined, not by the common things and every-day circumstances of life, but by its accidents and its least probable occurrences. It is much as if a teacher of cookery to the artisan-wives of the future were carefully to avoid telling them how to make soups and stew beef and boil potatoes, but were to instruct them minutely how to make *Kromesquies Russe* and how to flavour *Talleyrand Outlets*. We do not object, be it observed, to children, even of the poorest and lowest classes, being taught something of fables and fairy stories, and mythological and ecclesiastical legends, as well as something about the great masters and masterpieces of literature. What we do

object to most decidedly is the proposal to make these the main, almost the sole, instruments of culture in common schools.

It is necessary to remember that the children of "the masses" are dependent on their reading books at school for most of the information on common subjects that is to serve them for the business of life. Miss Christie is aware of this, but she wishes to confine the information given them to the most recondite and least practical subjects. School reading books, she says, ought to familiarise the scholars with "all those great names and great ideas which represent the common stock of cultivated thought and feeling in the civilised world." That ideal may serve very well for children of the upper classes, who are taught either privately or in small schools; but for the children of the masses it is out of the question. What is chiefly required in the case of the latter is to train them to become useful members of society—intelligent workmen and work-women, and good citizens—to fit them for their place in that workaday world in which it will be their lot to live and labour.

We are quite prepared for Miss Christie declining to admit, or failing to appreciate, this view of the case. She objects, for example, to some lessons on hygiene in one of the books in use, on the ground that they may be useful for parents but must be very dull for children. There is no need, she says, for children under thirteen years of age to be told how to diet themselves and ventilate their rooms and guard against infection. All this will be done for them by their parents, and "parents are provided by nature for children of all classes." We shall not dispute with her whether nature provides parents *for* children or *with* children: what we are concerned to know is, how the parents are to act for their children if they themselves have not been taught what is the right thing to do. The principles of hygiene do not, as a rule, come by intuition, and the chief reason for instructing young persons in them is that these young persons will be the parents of the next generation. Miss Christie evidently believes that ideas imbibed at school remain through life. Can it do harm if some of these ideas are concerned with the laws of health and the rules of household management? As a rule mothers do the sewing and mending as well as the cooking for their families. That, according to Miss Christie, would be a sufficient reason for not teaching girls either to sew or to cook.

We notice that Miss Christie is prepared to allow the children in common schools some crumbs of knowledge in addition to her sublimated essence of "real literature." These additions, however, are very limited. She would admit some history, and a small amount of grammar and geography; but absolutely nothing else. The geography would include "such elements of Astronomy as everybody ought to know." This is her bill of fare for the education of "the

great unwashed." There is not much originality in it, excepting in its application to a new stratum of society. Half a century ago young ladies of the upper class used to be sent to fashionable boarding-schools to learn "mythology, chronology, and geography, with the use of the globes." That is evidently where Miss Christie has got her specific for the education of working men's children. We are not aware that the system was so successful in making the women of "the upper crust" very intellectual, or acute, or very useful as members of society, that we should wish to apply it to the training of our future artisans, mill-workers, and domestic servants.

Miss Christie would have history taught in a set of special readers. To this we cannot object, as we have ourselves added a set of history readers to the *Royal* series. But her proposal to reduce grammar and geography to "strings of questions and answers" fills us with astonishment. At the same time it serves to throw a flood of light on her educational standpoint. She is evidently a follower of "the ingenious Mangnall," as Mr. Fitch calls that author, who believed that anything and everything could be learned by committing to memory cut-and-dried answers to pedantic questions. There is no doubt that on some subjects a good deal of useful information may be accumulated by that means, but the information can refer only to matters of fact. Therefore it is conceivable that certain parts of geography might be taught in that way; but that any sound knowledge of the principles and processes of grammar can be acquired by it is, to us at least, quite inconceivable. We do not believe that any amount of mere catechising would ever enable even a sharp-witted child to analyse or parse a sentence, and no one can be said to know grammar who cannot do that. Moreover the method, by whatever name it may be called, is in no sense education. It is purely mechanical on the part both of teacher and of scholar. It makes the scholar merely a rotary word-grinder, and reduces the teacher to a lesson-hearing machine. In fact its sole advantage, and the sole cause of its long survival, was that it enabled persons to act as teachers who were ignorant of the subjects which they professed to teach. We had believed that the day of Mangnall was practically over even in private schools, as it is certainly in schools under Government inspection. The system belongs to a past school of educational thought.

One of Miss Christie's most serious objections to the modern style of readers is that they attempt to be self-explanatory. "It is this," she says, "that has brought the existing books to their present state." She would have no notes or vocabularies in the reading books. Every school should have its shelves of dictionaries and other books of reference; and whatever difficulties have to be solved should be solved by the scholar looking out the word in the proper

book. The plan is admirable in the case of a private school or a private pupil, but in a public elementary school it is quite impracticable. Unless a dictionary were provided for every scholar in a class that was preparing a particular lesson, there would necessarily be confusion and much waste of time. Moreover, young children have often great difficulty in selecting from a dictionary the particular explanation that suits the passage in their lesson in which a particular word occurs. Still further, the meanings of new and difficult words would be in most cases forgotten as soon as seen, unless they were written down. When the meanings and explanations are appended to each lesson in the reading book they are likely to be suitable, and they can be easily referred to by every scholar and readily committed to memory. The chief reason, however, for making reading books self-explanatory is that very few of the scholars have at home the dictionaries and other books of reference required for the thorough mastery of their lessons.

These, of course, are considerations that would not occur to any one who had not intimate knowledge of elementary school work. Neither Miss Christie's suggestions nor the reasons with which she supports them—though they are couched in clear and vigorous language—seem to belong to the atmosphere of the elementary school as it exists to-day. If she could induce any school board with an experimental turn, or any good-natured schoolmaster who was indifferent to grants, to make trial of her "real literature" scheme for, say, six years, the result we suspect would go to show that there are drier bones in the world even than the set of readers "which is pronounced best by the almost unanimous verdict of the school inspectors."

W. SCOTT DALGLEISH.

(One of the Editors of Nelson's Royal Readers.)

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

AFTER lingering eleven weeks in protracted agony, suffering many things of many physicians, but nursed through the whole of that dreary time by his devoted wife, President Garfield died on the 19th of September, from the effects of the shot fired by Guiteau on July 2nd. The post-mortem examination showed that from the first recovery was impossible, but until the last it was hoped and believed that he would recover. The many vicissitudes of his illness, the hope encouraged by his frequent rallies, the innumerable incidents of the sick-room, reproduced in every newspaper in the Union, had concentrated to an unprecedented degree the interest of the English-speaking world on the sorely wounded man who carried on for so many weeks such an indomitable struggle with death. People had begun to count upon his recovery as a certainty, when a change ensued for the worse, and during the last two days of his illness it is no exaggeration to say that the eyes of two nations were fixed upon the sick-chamber at Longbranch. When at last his death was announced the news was the signal for the most spontaneous and general mourning that ever united two nations in a common emotion. From the Queen to the vestry of Clerkenwell every one in this country joined in the transmission of sympathetic messages to America. For the first time in our history there was absolute unanimity in the sentiments of the old country and the new, and in this universal outburst of a genuine sorrow among all English-speaking men may be seen a happy augury of the future union of the race. General Arthur took the presidential oath within three hours of his predecessor's decease, and the executive power of the Government of fifty millions of men changed hands almost unnoticed amid the general grief. President Arthur, although belonging to the Grant-Conkling faction of the Republican party, is too shrewd as well as too patriotic a statesman to break roughly with the Cabinet on the policy of his predecessor. Without attempting to forecast the influence which the change is likely to have on the immediate future of American politics, it may safely be said that the tragic death of the chosen chief of the American Republic has done more to consolidate the union than anything that he could have effected by his life, and at the same time it has strengthened the ever-increasing ties of sympathy and affection which bind together the crowned and uncrowned democracies which speak the English tongue.

After the death of the President the weather has been the most important factor in the history of the month. It has ruined the harvest in England by excessive damp, while in the United States as excessive a heat has filled the American press with narratives of flaming forests and vast districts desolated by drought. The

heat has suspended military operations in Algeria, and in Tunis the army of occupation, fever-smitten, has been unable to make headway against the Arabs, on whose side fought the torrid rays of an African sun. The trace of the heat will soon be over, but the rain will leave more permanent marks on the political development of Great Britain. Three bad harvests in succession brought the Irish peasantry to despair, and compelled the imperial legislature to postpone all other work in order to effect a great economic and social revolution in the tenure of land in Ireland. It seems by no means improbable that the bad harvest which has cruelly disappointed the expectations of the English agriculturists may have results not less important than those which followed the failure of the crops in Ireland. A succession of bad years had brought many a British farmer to the verge of bankruptcy, from which he had indeed only escaped by repeated but temporary remissions of rent. The fine promise of the opening year, and the brilliant sunshine of July, encouraged the agriculturist to hope that at last a bountiful harvest was to reward his labours, and enable him once more to feel sure of his position. When the time for the in-gathering arrived his hopes were blighted by a continued downpour of rain. Through the cloud-covered sky the sun shone, if at all, with a watery gleam portending further showers, and the promise was fulfilled. The cut corn sprouted in the stooks, and as day followed day with no intermission of the rain hope died in the farmer's breast. The harvest which was to have put everything to rights had been spoiled. His last chance seemed to have disappeared, and it was with a heart heavy with despair he availed himself of the few belated days of sunshine to gather in the damaged grain.

The first immediate result of the unseaworthy weather was the loss of a Liberal seat in North Lincolnshire. For some time the Conservatives seemed to be unable to find a candidate, and Colonel Tomline had the field to himself. At last Mr. James Lowther, the original patentee of the art of political obstruction, who had the further distinction of having been one of the worst Irish Secretaries on record, volunteered to lead the forlorn hope. Appealing to the suffering farmers of North Lincoln, the sons of men who had been the staunch supporters of the Corn Laws, he boldly raised the standard of Protection. It was evident to the crowd whom he addressed in the pouring rain that the Liberals had not brought fine weather; and although Mr. Lowther did not venture to promise them sunshine in exchange for their suffrages, he did not hesitate to promise them an import duty on foreign corn. So far as his ability to keep his pledges was concerned he might as well have promised them sunshine; but whereas the veriest dolt can see that politicians have no control over the weather, distressed agriculturists may fail to see the reasons which place a corn law as far beyond the reach of our Chancellor of

the Exchequer as the sun itself. The bait, however, took. The farmers rallied round the man who promised to tax the bread of the people to enable them to pay their rents to their landlords, and Mr. Lowther was returned by a majority of 471.

The election in North Lincolnshire, followed as it was the next day by a second victory in North Durham, where Sir George Elliot won back his old seat by an alliance with Mr. Parnell, came as manna from on high to the disconsolate Conservatives. The "Fair Traders," as the Protectionists style themselves, were elated. Every Conservative candidate—Colonel Knox in Tyrone, Mr. Bulwer in Cambridge, and Mr. Trotter in Berwick—hoisted the Protectionist flag; and even Sir Stafford Northcote so far forgot what was due to the keeper of the economical conscience of the Conservative party as to adopt at a political banquet at Sheffield the shibboleth of the new Protectionists, and make an equivocal declaration in favour of "fair trade." "I am a free-trader," said the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, "but I desire to see free trade universal and fair." His words were eagerly seized upon by his most energetic supporters to justify their adhesion to the "fair trade" propaganda, and the movement in favour of making trade brisk by making bread dear took larger proportions. The effect on the Liberals was not less great. The manifestation of discontent on the part of the farmers drew attention to the necessity for redressing the grievances of the agriculturist. The fact that the Opposition were off on a false scent offered the Ministerialists an opportunity of which they were not slow to avail themselves. The farmers of Aberdeenshire were the first to indicate the direction in which improvement was possible. After a series of meetings asking for a reduction of rent, the demand for a Land Bill on the lines of the Irish Land Act took formal shape. The demand was immediately endorsed by the Farmers' Alliance and the Trades Union Congress. The farmers' agitation spread to other Scotch counties, and during the contest in North Durham it was found that the northern farmers entertained the strongest opinions as to the necessity for effective legislative protection against the confiscation of their improvements.

Tyrone election, where in spite of the vehement opposition of the Land League and the Orange lodges Mr. Dickson was returned at the head of the poll, seems to show that in Ulster the farmers are inclined to accept the Land Act with gratitude, and loyally co-operate with the English Liberals in the removal of the other grievances of Ireland. But the victory in Tyrone was won under a restricted franchise. If the non-electors had voted, Mr. Dickson would hardly have been returned as the representative of a county more than one-half of whose population are Roman Catholics. The Land League Convention, which met in Dublin on the 5th instant, displayed but little disposition to endorse

the verdict of Tyrone. It did not counsel the rejection of the Act right out, which was so much gained, but it accepted it conditionally upon the understanding that if it did not reduce rents at least one-half—Mr. Parnell asserted the only fair reduction was one of 88 per cent.—it could not be regarded as even a temporary settlement of the Land question. Too much importance, however, should not be attached to the cut and dried resolutions submitted to the Convention by men whose first anxiety was to continue to earn “the American money”—that is to say, the weekly subsidy of £1,000 remitted to the treasurer of the Land League by the organ of American socialism, avowedly in order that the agrarian movement in Ireland may be fostered for the benefit of the communistic propaganda in the United States. The Land Act has not yet got into operation, and some months must pass before it can be seen how far it is likely to remove the discontent of the Irish people.

The negotiations for the renewal of the commercial treaty with France have been resumed with some prospect of a successful issue. M. Gambetta reaffirmed his belief in free trade principles in a speech at a banquet at Honfleur, and it is believed that the new Ministry, of which he is to be the head, will prove more amenable to common sense than the Cabinet of M. Ferry. England, excepting on political grounds, regards with comparative indifference the renewal of a treaty which, in appearance at least, is a concession to an unsound economical principle. On political grounds, however, there is sufficient reason to rejoice at the resumption of negotiations which tend to bind more closely together the two great nations of the West. Of the need for strengthening the ties of friendship between England and France, the present month has afforded a striking example.

In Egypt, the two Powers have entered into curious and anomalous partnership for the control of the government of the Khedive, which it is much more easy to condemn than it is to explain how it can be terminated. Egypt is an integral part of the Ottoman Empire. Its affairs are therefore, from the point of view of international law, subject to the provision of the treaties of Berlin and Paris. All the powers are bound to abstain from isolated intervention in its affairs, as in those of any other province of the Turkish Empire. All of them are bound to deal with questions arising in the Nile valley in concert, as a matter of European concern. The whole tendency of English and French policy for many years has been to minimise the control exercised by the Sultan over his vassal on the Nile, and under Ismael the tie which bound Cairo to Constantinople was of the slightest. The Khedive, excepting the performance of some formalities and the payment of a fixed tribute, was an independent sovereign in all but in name. Yet within the last two years all this has been reversed. To secure the removal of Ismael, the Sultan was encouraged to assert his right to depose at will the ruler of Egypt, and at the

same time that Egypt was thrust back under the influence of Turkey, England and France undertook an extraordinary and ill-defined function of control over the new Khedive. The inconsistency of their position was emphasised by the means which brought it about. If Egypt had been independent of Turkey, its control would not have concerned the rest of Europe. But the control was assumed or consolidated simultaneously with the assertion by the Sultan of a sovereignty which brought Egypt within the region from which all but the concerted action of all the powers was expressly excluded. The control was financial, not administrative. The controllers were paid by the Khedive, and although they had a right to attend all councils of the Ministry, they had no voice in its decisions. The arrangement was anomalous to the last degree, but as the other Powers did not protest, and the joint control exercised by Mr. Colvin and M. de Blignières at Cairo, produced indisputable benefits to the dwellers in the Nile valley, to say nothing of the subsidiary advantage to Europe of maintaining order and tranquillity in Egypt, it came to be regarded as both natural and expedient. It rested, however, on a very precarious basis. The good-will or the impotence of the Khedive, the acquiescence of the Sultan, the absence of any opposition on the part of the others powers, the cordial co-operation of the representatives of England and Egypt, and the submission of the army, were all essential to its success. It was endangered by the intrigues of the French Consul-General de Ring. He was recalled, and the danger of a rupture was averted. A more formidable peril disclosed itself in the insubordination of the army. Riaz Pasha, in many respects an excellent minister, was too weak to keep the army under control. Repeated displays of a spirit of insubordination were left unpunished, and more than once it seemed as if the colonels were becoming the supreme power in the State. This mutinous spirit culminated on the 10th of September, when Ourabi Bey surrounded the Abdin Palace with 4,000 soldiers and demanded the dismissal of Riaz Pasha on threat of deposition. "We have your successor ready," said Ourabi to the Khedive; and the Khedive, instead of taking Mr. Colvin's advice and boldly arresting the insolent although timorous mutineer, condescended to treat with him. Ourabi insisted on the dismissal of Riaz, but consented that his other demands, viz. the increase of the army to 18,000 men and the concession of a constitution, should be referred to Constantinople. Cherif Pasha, after some hesitation and a period of suspense, when something like a panic reigned among the European residents, consented to take office. His conditions having been conceded, the colonels declared their submission, and for the moment the crisis was averted. It had lasted long enough to excite serious alarm in London and Paris, and to display in a very striking light the perils of the system of joint control. It was

admitted by both Governments that it was impossible to allow Egypt to fall into the hands of a mob of mutinous soldiery, but beyond this preliminary agreement it seemed hopeless to come to an understanding. A section of the French press loudly accused England of having brought about the pronunciamiento immediately after the departure of M. de Blignières, and all the Parisian papers were unanimous in declaring that on no account whatever should the Sultan be allowed to send troops to disperse the mutineers. On this side the Channel protestations as vigorous were made against the landing of a single French soldier in Egypt, and inferentially against the Anglo-French expedition which was believed to be in favour with the French Ministry. If the Khedive appealed to the Sultan for assistance, England and France, it was contended, ought not to take the responsibility of vetoing the despatch of such forces as might be requisite to restore the authority of the Khedive. Their influence might be more legitimately employed in providing stringent guarantees against the abuses which usually follow in the train of an Ottoman occupation. These views were vigorously combated in Paris, and fortunately the timely arrangement of a compromise obviated the necessity for calling in force of any kind. The crisis, however, lasted long enough to show that there was an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the Powers which exercise the control as to the means to be adopted for reducing the colonels to submission, and that there was an evident desire on the part of at least one of the other Powers to avail itself of any deadlock at Cairo to insist upon sharing the position now occupied exclusively by England and France. The situation is dangerous, and no one as yet seems willing to propose the only real solution of the difficulty, the conversion of Egypt from a Turkish pachalic into an Oriental Belgium, whose independence and neutrality is guaranteed by all the Powers. If another Leopold could be secured for the throne of the Pharaohs, such a solution would satisfactorily solve the problem which might at any moment involve this country in serious difficulties if not in actual war.

The state of Europe is not exactly that in which England can afford to leave open a question of such vital interest to her imperial position as the sovereignty of the Nile Valley. The day before Ourabi Bey made his pronunciamiento at the Abdin Palace the triple alliance of the military empires was reconstituted at Dantzic, where the Czar and the Kaiser met for the purpose of proclaiming the renewal of the Kaiserbund. Prince Bismarck was present at the interview; General Ignatieff was not. The significance of the accident is variously interpreted, but it is believed that the Czar's chief object was to declare his adhesion to the old maxim which has governed the policy of Russia—"Nearest neighbours, fastest friends"—and to secure the support of his imperial neighbours in the projected *razzia* of revolutionists throughout the Continent. If the

Nihilists were but denied shelter by the civilised world the emperors imagine they would be safe, but the chances are all the other way. Sophie Peroffski and her accomplices never quitted Russia till they were hanged. Vera Savsulitch shot General Trepoff before she went abroad, and Solvieff shot at the Czar without having crossed the Russian frontier. A few more assassins might be hanged, but as assassinations are almost invariably attempted by those over whom the power of the Czar is already absolute, the suggested international crusade against the Nihilists will not effect much beyond making Nihilists more desperate. They are less dangerous outside Russia than within. If the whole of Europe were to be converted into a Russian gulch it would not in the least remove the temptation to strike at the chief gaoler. The attempt, however, is likely to be made, and it is to be regretted that England's position *vis-à-vis* any such attempt to limit the freedom of asylum has been seriously weakened by the incredible folly of the speeches of the Home Secretary concerning the threats of O'Donovan Rossa.

It is doubtful whether England can rely upon any ally in Europe in maintaining the right of asylum. Switzerland has already expelled Prince Krapotkin, whom Mr. Cowen has engaged to deliver a series of lectures in this country upon the internal state of Russia. Italy and Austria will probably follow the lead of the Northern Courts. France, upon whom we ought to have been able to rely, is in no position to render effective assistance. The stock-jobbing speculation which plunged her into war with Tunis has practically deprived her of that freedom of action which she had but recently regained since the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. Every month that has passed since she dictated the treaty to the unfortunate Bey has increased her difficulties in Africa. Southern Algeria has to be reconquered, and in Tunis the work of conquest has to be begun. She has sent 50,000 men to Africa since hostilities began, and she could not prevent the Arabs from cutting off the water supply of the capital. Nor can she exercise authority over a foot of Tunisian territory not covered by the range of her guns. She has occupied with or without bombardment various forts on the sea-coast, but inland the Arabs are masters of the situation. A march upon Kairouan, ordered weeks ago, has not been carried out, General Sabatier's column not having been able to get beyond at Zaghouan. The young soldiers, unaccustomed to campaigning under an African sun, have sickened and died. The hospitals are crowded, and every day fever sweeps off its ill-fated victims. It is no longer the Khroumirs or Bou Amema with whom France has to cope. She is face to face with Arab Africa in arms. The tribes are in motion from Morocco to Tripoli, and for months to come she will find ample occupation for her energies in asserting her authority over insurgent Islam. To conciliate Spain she has promised to pay, with a view to action in Morocco, two million francs indemnity to the ruined colonists of

Oran, and all her protests have failed to prevent the heavy reinforcement of the Ottoman garrison in Tripoli. M. Roustan's "war for business" is not turning out to be such a good speculation as he anticipated, and the whole of the West suffers from the baleful ascendancy which stockjobbers have been able to secure in the politics of France.

The result of the French elections was definitely ascertained after the balloting of the 4th September. The new Chambers will consist of 457 Republicans of various shades, 47 Bonapartists, and 43 Monarchists. On the whole the Republicans have gained 71 seats from the reactionary parties, whose gross poll fell from 3,577,882 in 1877 to 1,789,767, or almost exactly one-half. There were 2,997,902 abstentions, an increase of 1,136,776 on the numbers who did not vote in 1877. The aggregate Republican vote, which rose from 4,028,153 to 4,367,202 in 1877, amounted to 5,128,442 in 1881. The collapse of the Monarchical parties is very remarkable, and there is the customary quantum of squabbling among the reactionists as to the cause of their defeat. It may be attributed largely to the fact they had nothing to offer France but a barren programme of revolution in the interest of detested dynasties. What is much more remarkable is the collapse of the Catholic opposition to the anti-clerical crusaders. It says but little for the practical sincerity of the Catholics of France that they should have made so poor a protest against the domination of the party which has declared war against the religious orders, and demands the separation of Church and State. The *Tablet* is disgusted at what it terms "the cowardly submission of reckless negligence" displayed by the French Conservatives. There is much force in the bitter taunt of the English organ of the Roman Church that—

"A party which practically monopolised the representation of France only ten years ago, and which could have done anything it liked if it had known how to be united, tolerant, and businesslike, but which has allowed every advantage to be snatched out of its nerveless hands, can hardly be expected to exhibit amidst the disheartenment of defeat virile virtues which even the consciousness of power and the sense of duty could not develop. The copious use of pious expressions, doubtless sincere, and the systematic refusal, doubtless conscientious, even to stir out of doors to give a vote against a representative of irreligion, appear to be the confirmed tactics by which a large section of the Conservatives of France imagine that they are heroically defending the threatened interests of religion, morality, and society."

Religious conviction that is not sufficiently strong to make its possessor walk to the polling-booth can hardly be regarded as worthy the name, and of all the evidence that is accumulating to prove how little hold the Church retains on the French people the most conclusive is supplied by the clericals themselves.

It is very instructive to note the geographical distribution of party strength in France as revealed by the general elections. Fifty out of the ninety departments of France are entirely Republican. The

republicanism of nineteen others is marred in each case by the return of one "reactionary." There are only eight departments in which the Monarchists and Imperialists possess a majority of the representatives, and there is not one department even in La Vendée where the Republicans have not succeeded in returning at least one member. The whole of the eastern departments are exclusively Republican. The strength of the Monarchists lies in the west. Roughly speaking, the north-west is Royalist, the south-west Bonapartist, while there is a strong Monarchical element along the northern coast. At least half of the maritime departments in the north and west return Conservatives; but the departments on the inland frontiers and the Mediterranean are almost without exception Republican.

Much more important than the geographical distribution of parties is the distribution of party strength in the new Chamber. A warm discussion has raged ever since the elections as to the constitution of the new majority. At first every one assumed that the majority was Gambettist and revisionist, or, as we would say, advanced Liberal. Even M. Ferry seemed to take this view of the situation until he discovered in the electoral reverses sustained by M. Gambetta's henchmen reasons for believing that the new Chamber would tolerate the old Ministry. Broadly speaking, the Republican deputies may be divided into three groups: (1) the Extreme Lefts, small in number, but energetic and strong in the support of the great cities; (2) the Republican Union, which is Gambettist and revisionist, and numbers above 200 members; and (3) the Republican Left, representing the Ministerial majority in the late Chamber, which numbers 145 members. At first sight the Republican Union has obviously the best claim to be considered as the nucleus of the future majority. But it was discovered by ingenious supporters of the Ferry Ministry that 88 members of the Republican Union might fairly be classed with the Extreme Left. By adding these 88 names to the Extremists, and deducting them from the Republican Union, the Republican Left becomes the most numerous group, and may on that account claim to be regarded as the centre of the new majority. M. Ferry, and it is believed M. Grévy, favour this pretension, which is vehemently denounced by the Gambettists, who insist that the majority of the new Chamber belongs to the Republican Union, and that it is pledged to take in hand at once the revision of the Senate. *Scrutin de liste* is dropped until the next general election draws near; but M. Gambetta seems disposed to insist upon the revision of the Constitution if only to distinguish his followers from those of M. Ferry. There is no doubt that M. Gambetta received a severe personal check at the late elections, which to some extent impaired the effect of his political triumph. But it is equally indisputable that the new majority is more advanced than the old, and also that M. Gambetta is beyond comparison the most powerful as well as the

most skilful of all the statesmen of France. His recent reverses will have done him good service if they teach him the necessity of exerting himself as the actual leader, instead of posing as the veiled dictator, of the French Republic.

The neighbours of France display no indication of any intention to take advantage of the disorganization of her army consequent upon the war in Northern Africa. Prince Bismarck, preoccupied with financial anxieties, and despairing of being able to secure the establishment of the tobacco monopoly by any other means, has gone half-way to Canossa by sanctioning the appointment of Dr. Korum as Bishop of Treves. The Culture-Kampf is thus tacitly abandoned, a native of Alsace-Lorraine is raised to the Episcopal throne, and at a moment when the French Republic is entering with a light heart upon a fresh campaign against Clericalism, the German Chancellor comes to terms with the Pope. The change is momentous. If it succeeds, Prince Bismarck, who never does things by halves, and patronises as energetically as he persecutes, may yet be regarded as the *Defensor Fidei* of the nineteenth century, and if not the eldest yet the stoutest son of the Church. Such a rôle would stand him in good stead on both his frontiers with the Catholics of Poland and of the French provinces. But before the transformation is complete the Prince will probably wait to see how the Clerical vote will go at the coming elections, which are now fixed for the 27th of October.

The senatorial elections in Spain have resulted in the return of a large Ministerial majority. It is expected that Señor Sagasta will avail himself of the support of an obedient Cortes to decree civil marriage, not so much for the sake of would-be brides and bridegrooms who object to the religious ceremony, as to assert the supremacy of the State over the Church. In Italy the Ministry have successfully combatted an attempt by the intriguers, who are bent upon baffling the more Liberal instincts of the Pope to manufacture an international difficulty out of the disturbances which were provoked by the Vaticanists on the occasion of the removal of the body of the late Pope to its final resting-place. The race rivalry which constitutes the great domestic difficulty of the heterogeneous Empire of the Hapsburg continues to disturb the peace of the lands where Teheques and Germans contend for the mastery, and intensifies the hostility with which the Magyar press declaims against every manifestation of Russian activity in Eastern Europe. Greece has succeeded in occupying, without bloodshed, the province of Thessaly—an achievement of European diplomacy almost unprecedented in history. But according to close observers at Athens the completion of the occupation may mark the beginning of the end of King George's reign, and, as a sequel to the liberation of their kinsfolk, the Greeks may emancipate their race from the yoke of the Monarchy.



THE

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CLXXIX. NEW SERIES.—NOVEMBER 1, 1881.

HOW IS THE LAW TO BE ENFORCED IN IRELAND?

MR. JUSTICE O'HAGAN has seasonably reminded the public of England, no less than of Ireland, that of the ultimate effects of the Land Act no man can form a judgment either to-day or to-morrow. Meanwhile, the mere passing of the Land Act (Ireland), 1881, has produced one immediate result, which deserves the careful attention of the whole nation. It has brought the whole British people, no less than the British Government, face to face with one inevitable question: How is the law to be enforced in Ireland? That the law must, if possible, be enforced, is granted on all hands; and for this general agreement there are two valid reasons. If the statute is to produce any salutary effect at all, all illegal opposition to its action must be quelled, and that not for a month or six months, but for a period (say of at least five or six years) sufficient to allow time for the fair trial of one of the greatest legislative experiments which any State has ever taken in hand. The Act, again, is in reality a grand award determining the respective rights of landlords and tenants. The award has been made by the State with a view to what is just for all parties; the State, therefore, is bound by every consideration of duty, one might almost say of honour, to see that the terms of the award are carried out. To perform this duty is, it is admitted, a task of no small magnitude; and it is worth while, before considering how the difficulty is to be met, to state exactly what is its nature. In all matters which do not concern political differences or agricultural questions, the law is as well kept in Ireland as elsewhere. The criminal statistics of the country compare, it is said, favourably with those of other lands. Rape or larceny is at least as easily punished in Cork as in London. The difficulty, and the only difficulty, is, how to enforce in Ireland laws which have reference to the conduct of political agitation or to rights of landlords and tenants. How is this difficulty to be met; or, in other words, how is Ireland to be governed? Several answers to this question have been or may be suggested. My aim is to state

what these answers are, and to examine, in the driest and calmest manner possible, what may be their worth.

The answers to the question raised are threefold.

First. Ireland may be ruled (and the law, it is supposed, be enforced), as the country now is ruled, under a system of arbitrary government.

“Arbitrariness,” which is not necessarily the same thing as tyranny or oppression, is the essential characteristic of the present method of administration, or, in other words, of government by what is called coercion. That this is so cannot be disputed by any one who looks facts in the face. At the will and discretion of the Lord-Lieutenant, that is, in plain terms, at the will of Mr. Forster (subject to the supervision of the Cabinet), any man in Ireland, be he rich or poor, known or unknown, guilty of notorious crimes or innocent of all offence, may be arrested, thrown into prison, and be kept there without trial until the 30th of September, 1882. When, moreover, the prisoner comes out of confinement he has no remedy whatever for the arrest, even can he make it as clear as day that the arrest was the result of carelessness or malice. Every protection for personal liberty provided in appearance by the so-called Coercion Act—44 Vict. cap. 4—is, with one exception, absolutely futile. The one genuine limitation on the power of arbitrary arrest is the necessity of reporting every arrest to Parliament. Otherwise the Irish Executive is, as far as authority to imprison goes, absolutely despotic. Nor can any one now allege that the extra-legal powers conferred by the Coercion Act will be allowed to lie idle. They have certainly been pushed to their extreme limit; they have very possibly been pushed, though, perhaps, with valid excuse, beyond their extreme limit. The chiefs of the Land League are already in prison. All thoughts of using the Act for the detention only of village ruffians and such small fry have been abandoned; the Coercion Act is avowedly used as a means for breaking up the Land League; the aim of the Cabinet is so to administer the law as to ensure the easy working of the Land Law. Any person who recommends opposition to the Land Act, any person who directly or indirectly urges tenants not to make use of the Act, any person who thwarts or threatens to thwart the operation of the Act, runs a risk of finding himself suddenly transported to Kilmainham Gaol. It is not my object to criticise the action of the Government, which, be it right or wrong, wise or foolish, is, it must be admitted, approved by the vast majority of Englishmen and Scotchmen. My purpose is simply to make clear past a doubt that the existing mode of ruling Ireland is, whether it be a bad method or a good method, essentially arbitrary government. The policy of coercion is, disguise the matter as you will, simply the policy of ruling by means of discretionary preventive arrests.

The temporary advantages of despotic administration are obvious.

It is for the moment effective, and (what in times of revolution is of consequence) is seen to be effective. The arrest of Mr. Parnell; the re-imprisonment of that object of Mr. Gladstone's recent affectionate admiration,—Mr. Dillon; the seizure of men of mark, are strokes of statesmanship which impress the popular imagination. They may excite natural horror in Dublin and kindle offensive and brutal exultation in London, but they undoubtedly let everybody know that (to use an expressive vulgarism) "the Government is there," and bring before every man the most unmistakable evidence that the Sovereign of the country is to be found at the Castle and not at the offices of the Land League. It may further be conjectured that the recent *coup d'état* under Act of Parliament has been the means of guarding against impending dangers, hidden from the public, but known to the Ministry; sudden and startling arrests may be not only the safest but the most humane method of counter-working plots just about to explode. Indeed the apparent humanity of arbitrary government was probably the main consideration which commended the system of coercion to the present Ministry. This must, of course, appear the wildest of wild assertions to the crowds who are cursing at Gladstone and damning "Buckshot Forster," but any one who cares to give the subject a moment's reflection will soon see that despotic powers in the hands of humanitarians may be combined with a kind of leniency which is utterly incompatible with the stern, undeviating, fatal action of regular law. Suppose that Mr. Parnell and his associates, high and low, were at once put on trial before a court which would go simply by the evidence, and if the law has been broken would unhesitatingly convict the prisoners. Can any one doubt what the result would be? Some of the "suspects" (the term, by the way, is an odious one, utterly alien to the whole genius of English law) would be proved innocent, and released from confinement, but some, at any rate, would be turned into convicts, and exchange the comparative ease of life at Kilmainham for the severe discipline of genuine imprisonment. Statesmen of humanity, anxious above all things not to widen the breach between England and Ireland, might assuredly come to the conclusion (whether wisely or not) that preventive arrests, which involve neither trial nor punishment, are preferable to trials leading to conviction, to prison, and to penal servitude.

Such are the advantages of arbitrary government, but despotism, even though tempered by leniency, has, as a permanent system of rule, two fatal defects.

In the first place it is despotism, and has all the natural faults of despotic rule. No man, or body of men, can be trusted to wield arbitrary power. The present Cabinet are less likely to abuse excessive authority than any set of men to be found in England. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Lord Hartington, and Mr. Forster are too

well versed in affairs to yield to panic; they are too philanthropic to be guilty of any conscious cruelty; they are too much attached to the cause of justice and humanity to play any of those freaks of power which the literary zealots of force fancy to be the sole means of checking anarchy. But even such ministers as these may gradually go a good deal farther on the road of tyranny than they originally intended when they struck into a path of which they had no experience. The Coercion Act is assuredly not now used in the way in which its authors intended to employ it; it is stretched beyond its spirit, if not actually beyond its letter. For this the Ministry may deserve no blame, and had the Act never passed it might still have been their duty to arrest Mr. Parnell and save the State by deeds which needed the sanction of a statute of indemnity. Still, while the arrest of conspirators, the prevention of intimidation, or the dissolution of associations which in fact, even if not in name, are hostile to the public peace, may well become the bounden duty of the executive, it is impossible not to perceive, even on the part of the present Cabinet, a tendency (which may become dangerous) to create an offence utterly unknown to the law of England, viz.—the crime of advising Irishmen not to have recourse to the Land Court. The peril, however, of oppression at the hands of Mr. Gladstone or of Mr. Bright is, it may fairly be said, not serious. But neither Ministers nor Cabinets are immortal. The Government who have founded the system of arbitrary arrests will not always be the persons to administer it. The despotism of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry is assuredly in intention lenient and humane despotism; but the Coercion Act worked by ardent Tories such as Lord Salisbury, Mr. Lowther, or Lord Randolph Churchill, might produce a system of administration of which, to the Liberals at least, the tyranny was far more manifest than the leniency. Moreover, arbitrary rule, though it may under some circumstances be just, can from the nature of things never wear the appearance of justice, and the maxim, *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, is nearly as true and quite as important in the field of politics as in the province of jurisprudence. One must also never forget that the exercise of arbitrary power places almost insuperable obstacles in the way of the return towards paths of legality. Officials who have once become accustomed to unlimited administrative authority cannot if they would work under the restraints of law, and subjects who have been ruled under systems of arbitrary power lose the capacity for taking part in that "struggle for justice" which a celebrated German writer treats as the absolute foundation of progressive and orderly government. Mr. Gladstone and others have complained that the loyal citizens of Ireland have failed to give that individual assistance towards enforcing the law on which every ruler has a right to count; whether the complaint be just or not I cannot judge, but if the complaint be well founded

there is no difficulty in tracing the evil to its cause. In a country used to Coercion Acts and to suspensions of the legal guarantees for individual freedom there is certain to be a lack of vigorous individual effort in support of public authority. Nor does the essential evil involved in the very nature of despotism end here. The object of every statesman is to accustom Ireland to the supremacy of law. To oppose despotism to anarchy is in reality to pit one kind of lawlessness against another. Whatever be the result of such a contest, its very existence is fatal to the gradual development of respect for law.

In the second place, arbitrary government, as it must be administered by English statesmen, has, in addition to the natural vices of despotism, the peculiar and fatal defect of weakness. The gentlemen who the other day at Guildhall welcomed the tidings of Mr. Parnell's arrest with cheering and waving of hats and handkerchiefs, and the like disgusting signs of unseemly elation, no doubt fancied that the rule of strong government had begun, and that the Irish leader, who has been convicted of no crime whatever, had at last met with punishment. In this they were mistaken; it is very easy to arrest Mr. Parnell, but to make a man a prisoner is a very different thing from punishing him. A "suspect" is not a convict; to treat him as a convict would be a deed of the grossest and most revolting injustice. The Coercion Act itself provides that any person arrested under it "shall be treated as a person accused of crime, not as a convicted prisoner." Hence detention in Kilmainham Gaol is no fearful penalty; it is not more disagreeable than imprisonment under the Church Discipline Act. There is every reason to suppose that Home Rulers will bear easy martyrdom with as much cheerful equanimity as do Ritualist parsons. To some of them Kilmainham Gaol will be simply the vestibule to the House of Commons; to others it will be valuable as a certificate of undoubted patriotism. In any case detention, which is not punishment, and involves no social stigma, will, while it may be irksome to the sufferer, soon cease to inspire any terror among those who think of following his steps. None but a person of determined resolution would care to go through the painful experience of Michael Davitt. There is no man or woman of ordinary pluck who would greatly dread the sufferings of Mr. Parnell. The Government's bark is, as the saying goes, much worse than its bite, and the world will soon learn to treat the loud bark as no serious matter. There is, again, a practical limit to the power of mere arrest; you cannot put all disloyal Irishmen in gaol; the country would, I rejoice to believe, never bear to know that Irish gaols contained as many as, say, two thousand untried prisoners. What, again, is to be done with members of Parliament? Four of them are already at Kilmainham. The only practical result seems to be that the Land League can now hold meetings and draw up proclamations in gaol. Such proclamations are, as we see, issued

with ease. They assuredly will not impress the Irish people the less because they are signed by men who certainly are prisoners, and may well be held by their admirers to be martyrs. Is the country prepared to send all the Home Rulers, or half of them, to keep company with Mr. Parnell and Mr. Dillon? Parliament has indeed no love for Obstructionists, but more motives of self-respect will forbid the House of Commons to allow thirty of its members to lie in prison unconvicted and untried. To do so would be a strange and ominous method of convoking an Irish Parliament in Ireland. The hand, then, of the Government may at any moment be forced. Let the Home Rulers meet in Dublin and denounce the Land Act in the very language used by Mr. Parnell. If they are left at liberty his imprisonment becomes a palpable farce; if they are arrested, then, on the meeting of Parliament, the Coercion Act becomes unworkable. What this dilemma proves is not that the immediate action of the Government is wrong, but that preventive arrest cannot be used as an instrument of permanent administration. The supporters of coercion may, indeed, urge that it was never meant for more than a temporary expedient. One may, perhaps, be allowed to remember that temporary suspensions of the Habeas Corpus Act and other guarantees of personal freedom have, as history proves, constantly lasted for long periods, but the concession that coercion is a mere temporary device is enough for my purpose. A system of administration which is despotic, which is weak, and which cannot last, may indeed serve at a pinch, but can never afford the means for preserving order long enough to give the Land Act a fair trial.

Secondly. A vigorous effort may be made to govern Ireland by strict enforcement of law through ordinary legal methods.

The bare suggestion that we have struck into a wrong road, and ought at once return to the paths of legality, will strike many Englishmen as on the face of it absurd. The Coercion Act is in their eyes the guarantee against revolution; to propose that the power of arbitrary arrest should be dispensed with, and that reliance should be placed solely on the force of the law, seems to them like proposing that Dublin should be given up to the hands of the mob, and that Mr. Parnell should be proclaimed King of Ireland. Persons, however, who think in this way are victims to a double delusion; they vastly overrate the efficaciousness of coercion—on this point enough has already been said—and they greatly underrate the resources of the law. The arm of the law is stronger and reaches farther than peaceable citizens are apt to suppose. The vigorous action of the Irish executive, which during the last fortnight has commanded so much applause throughout Great Britain, hardly needed the Coercion Act for its legal justification. At any time the Government is bound to preserve the public peace, and possesses ample powers for the discharge of that duty. At any time the Govern-

ment may arrest criminals or persons charged with crime, may disperse mobs, and may quell riots, and for that purpose use either the truncheons of the police, or, should necessity require it, the fire-arms of the troops; the Government may patrol disturbed districts, may seize any man who intimidates or assaults his neighbour, and may give protection, by force of arms if necessary, to well-disposed citizens liable to be hindered in their legal pursuits. All this can be done by the Government, and has been done hundreds of times already, without any reference to the provisions of a Coercion Act. Treason, riot, sedition, and conspiracy were not made crimes by any Act of last session, they will not cease to be crimes when 44 Vict. cap. 4 has expired. If the members of the Land League have committed any of these crimes, then the leaders of the Land League are, quite independently of the Coercion Act, liable to arrest, trial, conviction, and punishment. Grant, however, that Mr. Parnell and his friends, while bringing Ireland to the verge of revolution, have avoided committing any crime. Even then the resources of legal government are not exhausted. Legislation can supply the defects of the criminal law. The Land League, and associations like the Land League, may be declared unlawful—not by proclamations, the effect of which, to say the least, is extremely doubtful—but by Act of Parliament. The ordinary law, again, is as far-reaching as it is strong. The Coercion Act is limited to Ireland, but a conspirator who has committed treason or has been guilty of sedition in Cork may be arrested in London no less than in Dublin. There is indeed some excuse for the popular failure to recognise the full power of ordinary law. The one fault with which the present Ministry can be fairly charged is the omission to exert, more than a year ago, every legal power which they possessed for the maintenance of order. It may certainly be contended with force that strenuous exertion of legal powers in the spring of 1880 would have made it unnecessary to obtain extra-legal powers in the winter of 1881. However this may be, it is demonstrable that but for one circumstance every consideration tells in favour of the exercise of legal authority, as against the exercise of arbitrary power. The apologists, however, for coercion will of course contend that in one essential circumstance, proceedings under the Coercion Act have an advantage not possessed by proceedings in accordance with the ordinary law of the land. Arrest under the Act does not involve bringing the prisoner to trial. Any other kind of arrest is merely a preliminary step to having the prisoner tried, and in every important case tried by a jury. But trial by an Irish jury means, it is urged, in the case of every man accused either of political or of agrarian offences, all but certain acquittal. The reason, in short, why coercion is necessary is, that Irish juries will not, as matters now stand, return verdicts for the Crown. As to the facts of the case the only authority to which Englishmen, with no

personal knowledge of Ireland, can look with any confidence, is the recent report of the select committee of the House of Lords to inquire into the operation of the Irish jury laws. The summing up of the evidence before them is expressed as follows:—"In many counties it seems to be admitted that while in civil cases or in criminal cases, into which no disturbing element enters, the juries will ordinarily find a verdict in accordance with the evidence, it is idle to expect them to do so in cases coming within the description of crimes arising out of disputes as to the occupation of land—crimes arising out of religious or political antagonism, aggravated assaults." "In such cases grievous miscarriages of justice have been of frequent occurrence. This tendency (*sic*), which, in the opinion of many witnesses, manifested itself previous to the recent disturbances, has, as was to be anticipated, become more conspicuous during the prevalence of the agitation which has overspread the country lately. In places where the agitation is most deeply seated the law has been again and again violated with impunity, not only because of the difficulty of obtaining evidence, but because even where it has been found possible to obtain it the jurors have refused to find verdicts in accordance with the facts. In such cases, though the criminal may have been detected in the act of committing the crime, though he may have been arrested bearing upon his person traces which could leave no doubt as to his guilt, though his identity may have been clearly established, the jury have again and again either disagreed or found a verdict of acquittal. These findings have repeatedly provoked the strongest censure on the part of the judges, and have in some instances led to the postponement of any remaining cases upon the ground that it was useless to submit them for trial. On other occasions the prosecution has been compelled to accept a plea of guilty upon an understanding that the defendants were to be liberated without punishment upon their own recognisances" (Report, p. v). The committee may indeed not have been entirely free from Conservative bias, and as to the extent to which the verdict of juries in criminal cases is untrustworthy there would appear to be a difference of opinion among equally competent witnesses. But the general truth of the conclusion come to by the committee is borne out by statement after statement in the evidence appended to the report. In some parts of Ireland "it is," according to Mr. Justice Lawson, "absolutely impossible to obtain a conviction now for any offence connected with any agrarian matter," and his lordship gives, from his own experience, two cases which fully support his statement. "The plain result" of such cases "is that it is a public announcement of a most emphatic kind to the people of the country that they may, with the most perfect impunity, attack a house at night, and although they may be identified by every one of the inmates, they will be sure to be acquitted."

"In any case connected with the land we found it impossible to get" the jury "to do their duty, though the evidence was perfectly clear." "In the country," says Mr. Gibson, Q.C., "in cases of an agrarian character, Boycotting cases, in which this unfortunate land question comes in directly or indirectly, there is no use in going to a jury. In a Crown case it has always been for some time impossible to get a conviction in any case of this kind, but in cases on the civil side, unless the case is so coercive that you are entitled to a direction by the judge who tries the case, there is very little use in going to trial, because any question of fact which can be suggested will be found against the plaintiff." Further quotations from the evidence on this matter would, if space allowed, be interesting, but they are for the present purpose superfluous. It may be taken for granted that trial by jury has, as regards a particular class of cases, broken down, and has become in other parts of Ireland besides the county of Limerick "a farce and a mockery." To admit this fact is quite a different thing from admitting the inferences drawn from it by those who base upon the difficulty of obtaining a verdict for the Crown an argument in favour of coercion. The case stands thus: The maintenance of the ordinary course of law can be shown to be in itself far preferable to the present system of arbitrary government. The sole argument in favour of coercion is that the operation of the law is impeded by a break down in one part of criminal procedure. The natural inference seems to be not that coercion should be maintained, but that the system of criminal procedure should be amended.

Thirdly. The experiment may be made of governing Ireland under the ordinary law reinforced by the partial abolition of trial by jury.

This (as far as abolition of trial by jury goes) is in effect the recommendation of the Lords' committee. They urge that the summary jurisdiction of the magistrates exercised without a jury should be extended so as to enable the justices to deal with rioting, aggravated assaults, the taking forcible possession of land, the right to which has already been disposed of by a court, assaults on process-servers, intimidation, and the like. But after these recommendations, which of themselves go a great way, the committee add—

"The evidence which we have taken has . . . forced upon us the conclusion that as long as a large part of Ireland continues under the influence of the present agrarian agitation, the steps which we have suggested will probably not prove sufficient to insure the punishment of crime. . . ."

"Under these circumstances it will be for her Majesty's Government to determine whether or not trial by jury should for a limited time, within a limited area, and in regard to crimes of a well-defined character, be replaced by some form of trial less liable to abuse.

"It has been suggested by some witnesses that the same results might be arrived at by empowering the judges to refuse verdicts which they believe to have been perversely found, or by having recourse to specially selected juries for the trial of agrarian and political crimes. We believe that if any departure

is to be made from the practice of allowing the guilt or innocence of an accused person to be determined by a jury of his fellows, it would be better altogether to suspend trial by jury for a limited time and for particular offences, than, while preserving the outward form of the institution, to supersede it in effect." —(*Report*, pp. xi and xii.)

This recommendation is manifestly a very grave one. No one who did not feel its whole gravity would be fit to consider the topic at all. It is no light matter to admit openly that one, and that perhaps the most popular portion of the British constitution, cannot without great restrictions be applied to a whole division of the United Kingdom. It is no light matter to take away from innocence any apparent safeguard against unjust conviction. The indirect and the political consequences of trenching on the sanctity of the jury-box are, in fact, so great, that before any change of the kind recommended by the committee can be made, the necessity for the change ought to be made so plainly apparent that no impartial man can doubt that the necessity exists. It were well that, even at the risk of some temporary increase in disorder, a desperate effort should be made to see whether, without the use of coercion, the ordinary law cannot be enforced by means of the existing mode of trial. This end might perhaps be attained by giving the Crown authority to carry out by proclamation the innovations suggested by the committee. If the jury itself was known to be upon its trial, both Government and people might make exertions such as have not yet been made to free the existing procedure from the discredit into which it has fallen. To any fair-minded man it will also on reflection be apparent that any inroad on the system of trial by jury ought to be accompanied by a total abandonment of the policy embodied in the Coercion Act. The one plausible plea for allowing (what in itself is monstrous) arrest and imprisonment without trial is, that as things now stand men admittedly guilty of crimes cannot on trial be brought to conviction. It may be right to keep Mr. Parnell in prison, if though he can be proved to have broken the law he cannot, owing to the partiality of Irish juries, be punished for having broken it; in this case he is kept in prison because he cannot have a fair trial. But if Mr. Parnell cannot be proved to have committed any crime for which he would be convicted on satisfactory evidence by a fair court, then his imprisonment (however convenient his confinement may chance to be for the Cabinet or for the nation) becomes an abominable outrage on every principle of justice. The bare supposition that he is kept in prison not because he has committed any crime, or is *bonâ fide* believed to have committed any crime, but because his personal liberty is inconvenient to the British Government, involves a charge of such odious injustice against the Cabinet that no impartial man would for a moment venture, without the strongest evidence, to entertain it. The fact, however, that this suspicion may be entertained by thousands of Irishmen who at the

moment cannot in reason be expected to be either calm or impartial, is of itself the strongest condemnation of the lenient despotism which at present rules Ireland; and persons who think, after mature deliberation, that the experiment of limiting the right to trial by jury is at least worth trying, may reflect that if to touch the jury-box be (as it most surely is) a grave inroad on constitutional traditions, may fairly reflect that we have but a choice of evils. The constitution has broken down already; Coercion Acts are incompatible with constitutional freedom. They are a far greater invasion of liberty than a change, however important, in the rules of criminal procedure.

To weigh with the utmost care the general objections which, on grounds of constitutional policy, lie against any tampering with such an institution as trial by jury, is a matter of the merest common sense. But he who has done this may then take calmly into consideration, first, what is the weight of the direct arguments in favour of altering the established mode of trial; and secondly, what is the force of the direct and specific objections to this proposed innovation.

The direct reasons in favour of substituting for coercion some such restrictions on the right to trial by jury as are recommended by the committee, must be in the main already apparent to my readers. The argument may be thus summed up.

Trial by jury has, in the only cases in which any one proposes to touch it, ceased over large portions of Ireland to effect its legitimate objects. It has become in many instances an actual hindrance to the maintenance of law and of justice. The committee, and many of the experienced witnesses called before the committee, have come to the conclusion that an institution which, in spite of its many defects, is traditionally dear to the English public, is unsuited to the present condition of Ireland, and that this unsuitability cannot be removed by any minor changes. The probability that this conclusion is true is strengthened by the reflection that the conditions which make trial by jury tolerable anywhere—namely, popular sympathy with the law, and a disposition on the part of jurymen to be guided by the judges—cannot from the nature of things be at the present moment looked for among Irish jurymen. It is shown that the administration of the law in Ireland has broken down at one particular point. The natural conclusion, therefore, is that this is the point to which a remedy should be applied. If but for the unwillingness of jurymen to give verdicts for the Crown, we could dispense with coercion, and allow Ireland to be governed under a system of regular law, the inference seems almost inevitable that the course of wisdom is at any rate to try what can be effected by abolishing the right to trial by jury. To do so is an evil, but this evil is a trifle compared with the evil of maintaining arbitrary government.

To every proposal, however, to substitute for coercion the abolition of trial by jury in any criminal cases whatever, two specific objections

are made, each of which is weighty, and deserves most careful consideration.

The first objection is, that to abolish trial by jury would be unjust, because without a jury no criminal could get a fair trial.

If this allegation be sound, it is, of course, absolutely fatal to touching in the slightest degree the so-called palladium of the Constitution ; but in truth everything depends upon what you mean by a " fair trial." If by this term be meant a good chance of escaping conviction for a crime you can be legally proved to have committed, I doubt not that either in England or in Ireland, or in any country in the world, a jury conduces greatly to fairness ; but if the words mean—as they ought to mean—a trial conducted with strict attention both to the rules of law and to the rules of evidence, and with no attention to any other consideration whatever, then one may well doubt whether a jury is any security for fairness. That an innocent man would prefer his fate to depend on the decision of the judge and not on the verdict of the jury is certain. No one who has sat in court can have failed to witness case after case in which the calmness or sagacity of the judge has saved innocent men from being convicted by the fairness of the jury. The merit, indeed, of a jury is not its fairness, but its unfairness. The one consideration which makes it worth while to keep up an awkward system of trial is, that an appeal to the jury, or in other words to popular suffrage, enlists public sympathy on behalf of the law. Could this advantage be obtained in Ireland the inconveniences or absurdities of trial by jury would be amply outweighed by its merits, but it is universally admitted that as regards agrarian disputes the Irish people do not sympathise with the law. This is, as far as it goes, a good reason for changing the law, but it is also a good reason for believing that trial by jury has not, in Ireland, the one virtue which compensates for its defects. " Fairness," in the sense of perfect equity or justice, the system of trial by jury never possessed at any time, and never will possess. The Bloody Assize in the West was, after all, the work of jurymen, no less than of judges. History, with her usual injustice, has loaded Jeffreys with well-merited infamy, but has let off with nothing like adequate blame the freeholders of the western counties who were the partners in his guilt. He could not have sent a single victim to the gallows without the aid of twelve respectable jurymen, and if the responsibility of the Bloody Assize rests more heavily on the judge than on the juries whom he bullied, it must be remembered that the judicial crimes connected with the Popish plot may be considered the special work of jurymen, influenced by popular panic and prejudice. It is of the more consequence to appreciate the true character of trial by jury, and the essential defects to which that mode of executing justice is exposed, because there prevails, in England, a tendency to fancy that the break down, in Ireland, of our favourite system of trial is due to some peculiar vice in Irish character.

What is the state of feeling which has caused that break down may be understood in a moment by a glance at one or two extracts from the evidence given to the Lords' committee.

"As to their (the jurors') sympathy being with the law or against it," says Mr. Huggard, "one must know Ireland very well to enable one to say what the motives are which operate with them. I would be unwilling to say that, in the ordinary sense of the word, the verdicts, though unsatisfactory, are corrupt. . . . To do a corrupt thing a man must wilfully do what he believes to be wrong. These men are led to believe, by persons upon whose judgment they rely, and in whose opinions they have perfect confidence, that the existing land laws are not only unjust, but that they are iniquitous. They are also told that there are certain inalienable rights which no human laws have a right to tamper with or to infringe, and they enter the jury-box fully recognising the fact that they have either to disregard the evidence and their oaths, or to do what they believe to be an injustice in finding a conviction against persons for doing an act which the law calls an offence, but which they believe to be justifiable, or perhaps meritorious."

Again, Mr. Hamill, chairman of the county of Roscommon, observes, "They do not think it is anything very flagrant to be indicted for an assault. They do not look upon it as a crime, such as they would the taking of a man's purse or anything of that kind."

The same idea is expressed in the evidence of Mr. Darcy Dowling, a solicitor of large experience in the defence of prisoners. "In Ireland," says this witness, "they draw very wide distinctions between what they call crimes against the law and what they call 'dirty crimes,' that is to say, larceny and robbery. In my locality they always call anything that is against the law a 'clean' crime."

Mr. Bolton, Crown solicitor for Tipperary, makes the following observation:—"There is no difficulty whatever in getting convictions for robberies or larcenies, because in Tipperary those offences have always been regarded as disgraceful. . . . If you cross-examine a man, and you ask him, 'Were you convicted?' he will say, 'Yes, I was; but, thank God, it was not for anything disgraceful.'"

These passages are well worth study, but they contain nothing which need cause any surprise to any man who knows what trial by jury really is. There is no need for reference to any peculiar moral or intellectual perversity inherent in Irish character. Trial by jury works, it is plain, in Ireland exactly as under similar conditions it would work, and has worked, in England. The jury is a device of more or less ingenuity for preserving harmony between the action of the law and the sentiment of the people. Wherever and whenever the class from whom juries are taken do not sympathise with the law, the system leads to an utter failure in the attempt to enforce punishment. If Englishmen became averse to capital punishment, convictions in capital cases would soon become unattainable. When in

the early part of this century popular feeling had become more humane than the law, which in fact represented a bygone state of sentiment, jurymen were apt to find an astounding difficulty in seeing the effect of evidence which proved a prisoner guilty of forgery, and would, if believed, doom him to the gallows. The transactions which are supposed, and in one sense rightly supposed, to cover the jury-box with a halo of traditional glory are transactions in which English jurymen refused to give effect to the law. In the time of Junius, as in the time of Erskine, the jury-box was really the field on which the English democracy fought out the battle of freedom with a government which but half represented the English people. No one supposes that Erskine's triumphs were gained wholly by his eloquence, and still less that they were due to a break down of the evidence on the part of the prosecution. The bias of the jury had at least as much to do with the matter as the skill of the advocate or the weakness of the case. Why is it, again, that a French jury never fails to find extenuating circumstances in favour of almost every murderer ? Why is it that no French Government not supported by popular sentiment could ever with safety leave political criminals to the verdict of the jury ? The answer is almost too obvious to be worth giving. In France, as in England, the moral sympathies of the jury go, and always will go, more than half-way to determine their verdicts. This is no accident. It lies in the very essence of the system. As it is elsewhere, so it is in Ireland ; jurymen who are themselves, if not members of the Land League, filled with the sentiments which have created the Land League, will never in so-called agricultural cases give verdicts for the Crown. The fact, therefore, that under the present condition of Ireland men cannot be convicted by means of trial by jury of offences which the law condemns, but popular feeling either applauds or condones, has in it nothing strange or startling. It is simply an exemplification of the fact that fairness is not and cannot be the merit of trial by popular vote. One may indeed safely assert that there is at the present moment no part of the United Kingdom where Mr. Parnell, if arraigned for conspiracy, could obtain a fair trial. If tried in London he would be certain of conviction ; if tried in Cork he would, I presume, be certain of acquittal. In either case the result would be unfair, for the jurymen would have given their verdict before they entered the box. There are many reasons for hesitating to adopt the recommendation of the Lords' committee, but it is not one of these reasons that if the jury were abolished the prisoner would not meet with a fair trial.

The second objection to adopting the recommendation of the Lords' committee is, that abolition of trial by jury would fail to attain the object for the sake of which a most unpopular innovation is advocated. Neither a judge nor a jurymen can, it is urged, condemn without evidence ; the law which now breaks down owing to

the unwillingness of jurymen to give a true verdict, would, if the jury were removed, break down through the unwillingness of witnesses to give true evidence.

This objection contains, no doubt, an element of truth. Whether the guilt of a prisoner be determined by a judge or by a jury, cases will constantly occur in which, from one circumstance or another, a criminal escapes conviction owing to defects in the evidence against him. We see this every day in England, and should, no doubt, in any case witness it every day in Ireland; but the acquittal of criminals whose guilt is not absolutely proved is a mere trifle in comparison with the harm done by the acquittal of criminals whose guilt is made as clear as day. Such criminals would never escape condemnation at the hands of any competent judge, and one may pretty safely conclude that there are two classes of offenders who, if guilty, would in Ireland, as elsewhere, be absolutely certain of conviction if deprived of the advantage of a jury.

Ruffians, in the first place, caught red-handed in the commission of crime, would not have a chance of escaping punishment. If any one doubts that many such ruffians now get off scot free, he should read the evidence of Mr. Justice Lawson at page 435 of the committee's Report. His lordship not only gives an account of two typical cases in which "roughs," whose guilt could not have been doubted by any man out of Bedlam, were found "Not guilty" by a jury, but also suggests by these examples to intelligent readers how numerous might be, under a system of vigilant police, the arrests of offenders whom a judge could find guilty without a moment's hesitation. Persons, in the second place, who are the public and acknowledged leaders in political agitations would, if they broke the law, find that when brought before a judge sitting without a jury they had scarcely a chance of escape. It would be most rash and unbecoming to assert that Mr. Parnell or any of his associates have broken the law. It is a matter on which no one at present ought to pronounce an opinion. This much, however, is apparent. The facts on which his guilt or innocence, say of conspiracy or sedition, depend consist of transactions—namely, the making of speeches, the signing of proclamations, and the like—which are from their nature not difficult of proof. Neither judge nor jury would be much puzzled as to the facts. The whole question to be determined would probably be, what is the inference to be drawn from the facts? To whatever conclusion a judge might come, he would not be hampered by want of evidence.

Moreover, the difficulty of obtaining truth from a witness is less than the difficulty of obtaining a just verdict from a prejudiced jury. To commit a distinct act of perjury in the witness-box is a far greater strain to the conscience than to join in a verdict of acquittal not justified by the evidence; an *alibi* seems for the moment really credible to a juror who wishes to believe it true. The chance, further,

of obtaining a conviction greatly increases the chance of obtaining evidence. It is one thing to swear that you were thrashed by a ruffian who, as you know, will come out of court scot free and thrash you within an inch of your life for having told of his assault ; it is quite another thing to bear witness against a ruffian who has put you within peril of your life when you feel well assured that your evidence will send him off to penal servitude.

No one of course can doubt that even were the whole system of trial by jury abolished, there would still remain many cases in which it would be impossible to obtain a verdict for the Crown even against offenders undoubtedly guilty of crime, but whoever thinks that a considerable increase in the number of just convictions does not greatly strengthen the action of the law has not, I apprehend, meditated deeply on the mode in which the punishment of crime produces its intended effect. Were it necessary for the maintenance of order to punish half the crimes actually committed, order could not be maintained in any country whatever. It is not the number of criminals actually kept in prison which constitutes the efficaciousness of imprisonment ; it is the dread which the risk of imprisonment spreads among men who, but for this fear, would otherwise be criminals. Once let it be felt that a man guilty of an agrarian offence runs, I will not say the same, but something like the same chance of conviction as a burglar or highwayman, and the problem of enforcing the criminal law throughout Ireland will be solved. What is required is, it should be remembered, not to produce any Utopian state of affairs under which agrarian offences, conspiracy, and assaults, and the like may be unknown, but simply to restore that condition of tolerable order which admittedly prevailed throughout the country till a comparatively recent period. The objection at any rate that the proposed modification in criminal procedure might not substantially contribute to the desired result is not made out, and is, when carefully examined, hardly maintainable.

The system of ruling Ireland, like other parts of the United Kingdom, according to the rules of law enforced in the ordinary legal methods, was and is the only satisfactory system, and the sooner we can return to it the better. There is, however, strong reason for thinking that this scheme of government has broken down owing to the fact that trial by jury is for the moment unsuited to the condition of Ireland and leads to failures of justice.

The system, therefore, of government which best meets the necessities of the case is to govern Ireland, like the other parts of the United Kingdom, in accordance with the ordinary law of the land, but to facilitate the due execution of the law by abolishing in certain cases, and perhaps only within certain districts, the right to trial by jury.

A. V. DICEY.

ANTONIO ROSMINI.¹

THAT the life of one of the most remarkable men of the first half of this century should have remained unwritten till now, is, from several points of view, a singular circumstance. It shows how slightly even the highest merit is regarded when its form does not fall in with the tendencies of the time, and how little a people, when tired of an old order of things, and convinced that it must look abroad for an example in order to construct a better, may know of its own great men. Rosmini had the misfortune to be, on the one hand, a Catholic priest, and, on the other, an Italian. Two greater obstacles to general recognition and influence could not readily be found. The progressive world of to-day is not prepared to look with favour or hope of profit upon the philosophical writings of a true and loyal son of the Church, and Italy, with an instinct not altogether to be condemned, has for a long time been so intent upon transalpine ideas, that it has hardly even a nod of approval for the men who would direct its eyes to the forgotten treasures hid away in its own bosom. To the recognition of Rosmini, in particular, there was a third obstacle, not less powerful than the others. He was not only a priest and an Italian, but, being a good priest, and, in his sense, a patriotic Italian, he tried to bring his church and his country into harmony, by reforming the abuses in the former and waking the feeble states of the latter from their selfish lethargy to a sense of national unity and a readiness for mutual help. In this way he placed himself in opposition at once to that strong party which, jealous and distrustful of the Church's influence, would be glad to see it indefinitely reduced, and, on the other, to that still stronger and less scrupulous party, represented by the Jesuits and their friends, which would willingly see every state in the world become as weak as water, if itself could maintain its influence.

With all these drawbacks, it is hardly strange that Rosmini should have remained hitherto almost unknown to the world, or that his greatness, as a man and as a thinker, should have been lost sight of in consequence of his mistaken efforts as a patriot and a priest. At all events, now that we have before us two thick volumes of his letters, a life written by a loving disciple who knew him intimately, and his own account of his unfortunate mission to Rome, we may reasonably hope that justice will finally be done him, and his true

(1) *Epistole Religioso-famigliare di Antonio Rosmini-Serbati*. Torino, 1857. *Della Vita di Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, Memorie di Francesco Paoli, pubblicate dall'Accademia di Rovereto*. Roma, &c., Paravia, 1880. *Della Missione diplomatica di Antonio Rosmini-Serbati alla Corte di Roma negli anni 1848—9*. Roma, &c., Paravia, 1881.

place, as one of the profoundest of thinkers, recognised by all fair-minded men. That his merits should ever be acknowledged by his ecclesiastical foes is as much too generous a wish as it is a hope too ignorantly optimistic.

Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, sprung from an old and noble family, was born at Rovereto, in the Tyrol, on the 25th of March, 1797. His parents, Pier Modesto and Giovanna Rosmini, the latter originally a Countess dei Formenti from Riva, on the Lake of Garda, were pious Catholics, but otherwise not remarkable. Antonio was the second of four children, and the eldest of three sons.¹ Being of an unusually fine, sensitive organisation, he developed rapidly, and early showed those tendencies and tastes which shaped his whole life. After distinguishing himself as a pupil in the gymnasium of his native town, he was placed for two years (1815—16) under the care of a private tutor, the excellent Father Orsi, who gave him thorough instruction in mathematics, but could not defend against his searching logic the then popular philosophical system of Locke, which he strove to impart. In philosophy the pupil shortly became the teacher.

It was during these years that Rosmini came to the resolution to enter the priesthood, a step which, in spite of the remonstrances of his parents and others, he practically took in 1817, by entering the University of Padua as a student of theology. At Padua he made himself many enthusiastic friends, bought himself a large library, and devoted himself zealously to study. In 1820 his father died, leaving him heir to the larger part of his wealth. In 1821 he was ordained priest, and shortly afterwards paid a brief visit to Rome, which, naturally enough, made a very deep impression on him.

The six years from 1820 to 1826 Rosmini spent in contemplation, living mostly at Rovereto, devoting himself to the study of philosophy, and enjoying, in frequent prayer, that intimate love of God which with him took the place of youthful passion. Here he read the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus, of St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and St. Bonaventura, of Locke, Descartes, Leibnitz, and Condillac, of Reid and Stewart, of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, as well as others by authors of less note. Here also he wrote a number of essays, a sketch of what afterwards became two works, the *Philosophy of Right* and the *Philosophy of Politics*, and some parts of his great work on the Origin of Ideas. Here, finally, he settled the question of his life-work, assuming a task from which he never afterwards for one moment turned aside.

(1) Neither of the other sons showed any remarkable talent; but the sister, Margherita, who became a sister of charity, in many ways resembled Antonio. A brief life of her has been written. The genealogy of the family has been traced by Father Paoli, in a work entitled *Antonio Rosmini e la sua Prosapia, la sua Casa e il suo Monumento a Rovereto, con illustrazioni*. Rovereto, 1880.

We have thus run over, as rapidly as possible, the first thirty years of Rosmini's life, because, in spite of the manifold activities with which they teemed, they were, after all, only years of preparation for the tasks whose execution alone gives them a worthy interest. Born, if ever man was, to be a priest, with none of those strong ties which bind the children of this world to family, society, and members of the opposite sex, he had no boyhood or youth in the ordinary sense of these terms. Though healthy, he was tender, delicate, and of more than feminine sensitiveness. Having, moreover, an unusual development of brain, he inclined from the first to occupy himself with intellectual matters. He had little taste for those games and sports of boyhood which go so far to make strong muscles, strong hearts, and strong friends, and to impart a healthy yet unexaggerated sense of personal importance. His games were books, his sports long hours of happy contemplation. Love for women he seems never to have known. Even his friendships, though strong and lasting, were rather enthusiastic religious sympathies than personal attachments. At the age of thirty he could write: "Beautiful is friendship; but more beautiful is the love of Holy Church. Family affection, too, is praiseworthy; so is love of country and nation; but oh! that family, country, and nation may be but so many means for advancing the Church of God!"

When we consider a character like this, so evidently intended for the cloister, the study, and the altar, we naturally feel as if he had been a man born out of season, five hundred years too late, as if his place were by the side of gentle, inspired John Fidanza—St. Bonaventura—whose nature is expressed in his own now much-abused phrase, "sweetness and light;" and, moreover, as if he could have very little to teach us, sons of an age of stormy activity, when thought, being a function of will rather than of intellect, is neither sweet nor fulgent. But such a feeling, if we were to entertain it, would most certainly mislead us. Rosmini is but one of the numerous examples of that law which ordains that no work done in love and good faith, however mistaken its aim, shall be lost, but that all shall count among the means whereby darkness, evil, and suffering are slowly but surely being made to cease. We may have to look away from Rosmini's ideal, to discount many of his results, to admit that he was in many things carried away by habit, sympathy, and prejudice; but, after all, enough of his work will remain to entitle him to a high place among the benefactors of mankind, and, in all things, to a respectful hearing.

Early in 1826 Rosmini removed from Rovereto to Milan, thus exchanging his life of contemplation for one of activity. During the two years which he passed in the city of St. Ambrose he worked out into perfect clearness the plan of his life-tasks, and took firm steps

towards the execution of them. Though we have said tasks, yet it was in reality a single great task, subdivided, indeed, into minor ones, to which he addressed himself. This was nothing less than the initiation of a complete reformation of human, and especially of Italian, society, through a restoration of the old harmony between Church and State, a restoration based on principles of reason, supplemented by truths of revelation rationally accepted. His aim was to do for the Church of the nineteenth century what Thomas of Aquino had done for that of the thirteenth, paying all needful regard to the new conditions and necessities. Indeed, next to Jesus, Rosmini took St. Thomas for his model in all things. He speaks of him as "the prince of Italian philosophers, whose dear footsteps on the arduous path of truth it always has been, and always will be, our endeavour to follow." And on that path he not only followed him, but overtook him and outstripped him.

In order to understand the aspect which social and political reform assumed in Rosmini's mind, we must take into account the circumstances of his birth and position. Born of a noble Italian family and reared in an almost cloistral atmosphere, untainted by doubt, heresy, or breath of that occidental individualism which shapes the modern world, he united to the instincts of the nobleman, the firm, authoritative convictions of the believing Catholic, and the autocratic, gregarious tendencies of the Oriental. Although the first were deeply overlaid, and in great measure transformed, by an almost boundless humility, charity, and kindliness, and the second so brought into connection with the upper limits of reason as to seem to rest upon it, both were nevertheless always present as determining elements in his character and intellect, while the last formed the constant factor in all his activities. Naturally enough, therefore, his ideal of a perfect society, as indeed of a perfect universe, was a complex of dependent, graded organisms, united and animated by a single supreme, independent principle; in other words, by God, omnipotent and incomprehensible, mercifully just and justly merciful. This ideal was such as might be expected to be held by a humane, gifted Christian, Catholic nobleman and priest, distressed at the tendency of his time toward pure rationalism, and believing in supernatural illumination, divinely delegated authority, social distinctions, and other hereditary and conventional advantages and disadvantages. Seeing clearly that, before this ideal could be attained, two main things were necessary—first, a purely rational system of thought which, while rendering reason innocuous by showing its limits and dependence, should demonstrate the need and antecedent probability of a revelation, and justify the claims of Catholicism as that revelation; and second, a devoted body of men to be apostles of this system—he resolutely set himself to the double task of realising both.

As early as 1816, while he was still at home in Rovereto, studying under Father Orsi, Rosmini had discovered the principle with which, aided by a free use of reason and an unprejudiced examination, comparison, and, where possible, reconciliation of all previous philosophies, he hoped to combat error, systematise truth, lay a solid basis for the sciences, and thus erect a ladder whereby to ascend the heights of theology. About ten years later, in 1825, partly under the influence of the Marchesa di Canossa, who had founded an institution for Daughters of Charity, he began to see the necessity of adding to the Church a new order, which should be the leaven of future society as conceived by him. In undertaking both these tasks he said (characteristically enough, as we shall see) that he felt himself moved by a "divine will," and, no doubt, from the first moment when he became aware of this prompting, he was silently working out the plans of them in his mind. It was not, however, until during his stay at Milan that he took active steps toward the accomplishment of either. Here he not only published the first volume of his *Opuscoli Filosofici* and wrote several smaller essays, but also laboured assiduously on what he meant should be the fundamental work of his entire system, his *New Essay on the Origin of Ideas* (*Nuovo Saggio sull' Origine delle Idee*). Here, too, he made the acquaintance of the energetic French priest, Father Loewenbruk, through whose influence he was induced to take immediate steps toward the definite establishment of his contemplated order. By way of preparation for this, Rosmini had already gathered round him a few pious, devoted men; but as they had no common home and no rule, they hardly even formed the basis of a religious community. Encouraged by Loewenbruk, Rosmini now determined to supply these essentials, and after much prayerful deliberation, fixed upon Monte Calvario, at Domodossola in Piedmont, as the spot most suitable for future action. Loewenbruk, having been sent in the height of summer (1827) to examine the spot, reported favourably, and so the two agreed to meet there on the 20th of February of the following year, in order to prepare for their important work, by spending the forty days of Lent in lonely fasting, contemplation, and prayer. The intervening months were spent by Rosmini in battling with enfeebled health, in manifold literary and other activity, and in much official letter-writing and visiting, in order to obtain the permission of ecclesiastical superiors to do the good he desired.

There is something inexpressibly touching in the thought of this simple, tender, gifted, noble, profoundly religious soul labouring under mountains of leaden tradition and official formalism, in order to lift some of his fellow-creatures into the light of God, and believing all the while that the mountains carry him and their lead buoy him up. Light, supernatural light, that is what he is striving for, the

thing for the sake of which he is neglecting much of the natural light. The hasty, vague metaphors of ancient dyspeptic mystics (unhappy heirs of abusers of the light and other good things of nature), metaphors now embodied in creeds, catechisms, and prayers, have become to him realities, and, indeed, the only true realities. Heaven and the vision of God, things of which he knows no more and can conceive no more than the clod beneath his feet, unrealities which attract only because, being unknown and unknowable, they are beyond the reach of even dyspeptic perversity, are the vocable idols or idol vocables at whose shrine he is preparing to sacrifice health, strength, energy, and all that can in any sense be called his.

Rosmini left Milan on the 18th of February, 1828, and celebrated mass at Monte Calvario on the following day. He expected to begin his forty days' silent fast in the wilderness on the 20th, in company with the never-silent preacher Loewenbruk, who meanwhile had been scouring the mountain villages round about, edifying the natives by French gesticulation and a language which they did not understand. Verily a wilderness it was to which he retired, an alpine wilderness; for Domodossola in February is a very different place from Domodossola in July. And Loewenbruk, following probably the light of nature and dreading silence, never appeared. So on the 20th Rosmini found himself alone with only his old family servant, on the top of a bleak, windy hill, in an old dilapidated tenement, of which only two or three rooms could boast of roofs, and these very leaky, with nothing to sleep on but a couch of not over-dry leaves, nothing to eat but herbs, which his astonished servant hardly even knew how to boil, and nothing to drink but torrent water. His only luxury was a daily walk under the neighbouring pines and chestnuts, and for that he had to pay a rent! But the brave, gentle soul, conscious of his own right will, was not daunted. On the contrary, hardship, privation, and desertion seemed only to increase his fervour of devotion. In the absence of men and things, he found God and ideas. We are curiously constructed beings. The currents of our nature run both ways; if we bar their entrance from without, they will immediately begin to flow from within, and it is often hard for a time to tell in which direction they are moving. But the exhausted nerves, the feverish or diminished pulse, and the wearied brain, continually confused by a vague, settled sense of want of time, in due course disclose the secret.

The weary forty days passed and still no Loewenbruk or any word from him. He did not even write for more than three months. Meanwhile Rosmini continued to fast, pray, and hope against hope, in the midst of which fasting, praying and hoping, he found time to work on his *New Essay* and the *Rule or Constitution* of his new society. The latter he wrote on his knees before a crucifix. The

main features of it had long been present in his mind, and had indeed formed the rule of his conduct from an early age. In 1825 he had written in his diary:—

“I, most unworthy priest, have resolved to shape my conduct in accordance with two principles, which are these:—1st. To devote myself seriously to setting myself free from my most enormous vices and purifying my soul from the iniquity with which it has been loaded since my birth, without going in search of other occupations or enterprises for the good of my neighbour, feeling, as I do, my utter incapacity of myself to achieve anything for their good. 2nd. Not to refuse any offices of charity towards my neighbour, if ever Divine Providence shall offer or present them to me, inasmuch as God is able to make use of any instrument, and, therefore, even of me, for His purposes; and, should this happen, I will preserve perfect indifference as to the nature of these offices, and perform those laid upon me with the same fervour as if I had assumed them of my own free will.”

Of these two “principles of passivity,” the former corresponded to what he called the *elective*, the latter to what he termed the *assumptive* state. They contain his whole theory of moral and religious life. “The whole duty of man” is to prepare himself to be a passive instrument in the hands of God. This is surely taking Christianity in earnest—God all in all; man but a poor, foully constructed, useless implement, which, by painful cleansing of itself from the concreted rust and filth with which omnipotent Divine Providence, in his “inscrutable wisdom,” has seen fit to disfigure it, may possibly induce this same omnipotent Divine Providence graciously to stoop down and use it, mayhap, in stirring up some other equally filthy and worthless implement to prepare itself for similar service. Man, with his boundless capacity for suffering, has no rights which God is bound to respect. Whatever befalls him he must coweringly accept, as coming from infinite wisdom, which being inscrutable, may, for aught he knows, be infinite folly, or absolute stupidity. Stated in plain terms, such is the doctrine, foolish enough and hideous enough surely—a base survival of notions current in times before tyranny and tyrants, having incurred the righteous indignation of this world, were constrained to take refuge in heaven, whose still unexplored wastes harbour a good many such fell monsters. But heaven is so far off that it has had no direct communication with us for nearly nineteen centuries now. Need we wonder if it has fallen behind in the race of civilisation?

Foolish or wise, such, at all events, was the doctrine with which tradition and education had succeeded in burdening the soul of the pious, inspired Rosmini. And bravely, manfully, self-denyingly, did he struggle with its Cyclopean bulk, trying with huge blocks of patent inconceivability, painted over with engrained prejudice and bound together with cunning clamps of unpatented, purely human dialectics, to build a rest for it, and so keep it from crushing the dear life out of him and his much-loved fellow-creatures.

Rosmini's solitude was in course of time somewhat relieved by the arrival of a few weaker brethren, good, pious, meek, much-crushed souls, desirous of putting themselves under his spiritual direction. Exceedingly poor in spirit, nor any better provided in purse, they needed help quite other than spiritual, and that too they received with no grudging hand. In all Europe they could have found no nobler or tenderer heart to appeal to. Finally, towards summer, the unreliable, erratic, polyphloisbean Loewenbruk also put in an appearance, and was received with open arms. And it was high time; for poor Rosmini's health, in spite of all his iron will, was fast giving way. Privation, neglect, and overwork had aggravated maladies contracted years before, and placed them beyond hope of cure. Henceforth, in addition to his grievous spiritual burdens, he must labour under the weight of numerous physical ones, some of them now so pressing that he must at once seek a milder climate and other remedies. Committing his few sheep in the wilderness to the care of Loewenbruk, he left Domodossola in July, after five months of destructive sojourn. The mineral waters of Reccoaro and his old home associations at Rovereto having in turn failed materially to benefit him, he finally, in November, started for Rome, which he reached on the 25th of that month. When he saw the cupola of St. Peter's rise over the horizon, he sang a *Te Deum* for joy, because he was approaching "the city chosen by God to be the capital of His kingdom upon earth." Much, it should seem, to the amazement of his less ebullient servant.

Rosmini remained in Rome for about sixteen months. He was treated with much kindness and consideration by Cardinal Cappellari, afterwards Pope Gregory XIV., and by other distinguished personages, was strongly encouraged by Popes Leo XII. and Pius VIII., then "happily reigning," to pursue with all vigour his philosophical studies, took steps to obtain the approval of the Holy See for his new order, and gave to the world, in four volumes, his *New Essay on the Origin of Ideas*. This work at once established his reputation as the most profound Catholic philosopher of his time, and was very soon introduced as a text-book into numerous schools and seminaries. Even, it seems, into some managed by Jesuits, which shows that that astute order, not yet seeing reason to dread his personal influence, had not discovered, as they afterwards found it prudent to do, that his writings were filled with the most damnable heresies. Thus Rosmini's visit to Rome, though not undertaken voluntarily, afforded him an opportunity for carrying out some of his most cherished schemes. In all the good that happened to him he saw God's special providence.

In May, 1830, Rosmini returned to Domodossola, feeble in health indeed, but full of new energy. He was enthusiastically received.

by his very little flock, and immediately resumed his habits of labour and privation. His life, from this time on, naturally divides itself into three periods: the first from 1830 to 1837, in which he worked hard and with only partial success at his double task; the second, from 1837 to 1848, in which everything seemed to go well with him; and the third, from 1848 to 1855, during which his faith and patience were put to the severest tests by the cowardly and slanderous machinations of wicked men, who sought to ruin, because they could not corrupt, him.

Shortly after his arrival at Domodossola, Rosmini sent an abstract of the plan of his new society to Cardinal Cappellari, who was deeply interested in it. At the same time he set to work to realise said plan, by entering upon a regular novitiate, along with his two or three friends, one of whom, the zealous Loewenbruk, he made his spiritual director. With much reluctance he allowed himself to be chosen temporary superior. After all, he took his share, and a large one, of the work of the house, sweeping, stove-polishing, lamp-cleaning, dish-washing, and other scullion drudgery. Poor enough and wasteful enough employment for a man like him! Curious enough, too, that it should seem an evidence of virtuous humility for a man to perform work altogether below the measure of his gifts! But such was the traditional mode of exhibiting that much-overrated virtue, a mode which gives excellent opportunity for the display of the corresponding vice as well. Hypocrisy! hypocrisy! not indeed of the base, lying kind, but of the sort reprovèd by Jesus; mere play-acting, the repetition of a part, learnt, not by heart, but by lips and limbs, and performed for performing's sake. Shall we never learn that the only genuine and valuable humility consists in a simple, truthful estimate of ourselves and others, and dignified action in accordance therewith?

Meanwhile Rosmini's reputation and that of his society were growing, and persons out of harmony with the arrangements of this little-known world came to him, asking for direction to another, considerably less known, but gratuitously assumed to be better. Towards the end of 1830, also, he accepted an invitation from the Bishop of Trent, a diocese then, as now, a part of Unredeemed Italy, to found a house of his order in that city, and from then till 1834 he lived partly there and partly at Domodossola, doing his best to educate men for the task of guiding their fellows, with some kind of infused, old-fashioned hope, to the limits of the Unknown. In these years he wrote his *Principles of Moral Science*, an excellent book, part of his *Supernatural Anthropology* (still unpublished), and his now famous *Five Wounds of Holy Church* (1833).

In 1834 Rosmini was called by the clergy and people of his native town to the pastorate of the congregation of St. Mark's. Though

accepting with much reluctance, once appointed, he did his utmost to perform his duty, as he understood it. So great indeed were his zeal and success in behalf of religion that they roused the suspicions of the Austrian Government, which, dreading his undisguised Papal leanings, threw such obstacles in the way of his favourite evening religious conventicles, that in October, 1835, he resigned his charge and returned to his previous mode of life. But the Austrian Government, now that its attention had been called to him as a man with a purpose, was not satisfied with this. Its agents began likewise to investigate his religious house at Trent, and finding that its constitution and tendencies savoured of Jesuitism, made such regulations as finally to break it up, a disaster which rendered him suspected and many of his friends lukewarm. Rosmini accepted all meekly and thankfully, as a dispensation of Infinite Wisdom. An attempt to found a religious house at Temié, in Savoy, failed chiefly through the defection of Loewenbruk, who had been left to manage it. This sturdy evangelist, in spite of his lasting respect for Rosmini, could not accept the "principles of passivity," finding the will of the Lord in his own, which was more convenient. A house, established at the Sagra of St. Michael, near Turin, was more successful, and, indeed, exists to this day. In England, likewise, the order found a footing, and has ever since met with much encouragement and success.

Amidst all this variety of outward activity, with its exciting successes and reverses, Rosmini's inner life remained perfectly unruffled. As soon as he had entered his chamber and shut the door, he could collect himself and turn to prayer, contemplation, and study. The doctrines of his *New Essay*, being diametrically opposed to those of the sensistic English and French philosophy, then current in Italy, were already calling forth serious attacks, and had to be defended. Some of these, indeed, he considered, and rightly, below notice; but the critical work of the gifted Italian patriot, Count Mamiani, then living in exile in Paris, drew from him the bulky volume entitled *The Restoration of Philosophy in Italy, proposed by Count Terenzio Mamiani della Rocca and examined by A. Rosmini*, in which he restated with so much admirable clearness and cogency the doctrines and conclusions of his *Essay* as almost to convert even his critic to them. Mamiani was, and is, a man of infinite fairness and good faith, a noble contrast to most of Rosmini's critics.¹

But Rosmini was getting tired of Austrian interference and sur-

(1) Many visitors to Rome are doubtless familiar with the kindly old man, now a senator and full of all sorts of mirth and genial remembrances. An Italian of the best type, a rich, well-balanced, straightforward nature, doing the right thing almost unconsciously, and little heeding whether it bring to him happiness or the reverse. He still writes voluminously, and edits a philosophical journal, *La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane*. His recent work, *The Religion of the Future*, is a noble contribution to the literature of that weary subject. What if the future, after all, should need on religion?

veillance. Accordingly, in 1837, having obtained permission to absent himself from Austrian dominion for ten years, he took up his abode at Stresa, a small but beautifully situated town on the western shore of Lago Maggiore, almost opposite the Borromean Islands. Here he acquired an estate, and upon it built a church and a house for the novitiate of his order, which he then removed thither. The house was at first far too large for the small number of its occupants; but he had faith that in time it would be too small, and that he lived to see. In the eleven years from 1837 to 1848 Rosmini may be said to have enjoyed as much happiness as ever falls to the lot of mortal man. Everything seemed to go well with him. His order increased and flourished, and in 1839 received the formal approval of the Holy See. He found leisure to pursue his philosophical studies, and to continue the working out of his own system, the documents of which, collected into thirty-one volumes, he now began to publish. Various fields of usefulness began to open up to him. He was surrounded by loving friends, such as Manzoni, Tommaséo, Bonghi, Gustavo Cavour (brother of the statesman), and received visits from many distinguished foreigners. His philosophy, indeed, was still attacked by men of various creeds; among others, by Vincenzo Gioberti, the great plebeian priest-patriot, in a work entitled *The Philosophical Errors of Antonio Rosmini*. This attack was a violent one; but Rosmini replied with much dignity, and Gioberti lived to repent his rashness. Rosmini's doings were likewise watched with suspicion and jealousy by his old friends, the Jesuits, and ominous whisperings were coming from some of their unacknowledged mouthpieces; but as yet there was no open display of venom. However, the time for that, too, was at hand. The year 1848 brought trouble to Rosmini, as well as to many others.

For twenty-two years of his active life, from 1826 to 1848, Rosmini, bent upon the execution of the great tasks which he believed the Almighty had given him to perform, had carefully avoided mixing himself up with interests, or assuming offices, which did not promise to contribute to the success of these. For this reason, though deeply interested in politics, both on account of his own position as an Austrian subject, and still more by reason of the difficulties in which the Church was beginning to find herself, he had never directly attempted to influence the course of them in one way or another. He had, likewise, steadily refused all ecclesiastical preferment, and even avoided all occasions when such might have been offered to him. Though the intimate and trusted friend of Pope Gregory XVI., he had accepted no preferment at his hands, and though that pontiff had promised him a house for his order in Rome, the quiet, trustful waiter for the day of the Lord took no steps to remind him of that promise. As he himself says, his motto was

that which he had inscribed over the door of his cell at Monte Calvario: "Bonum est præstolari cum silentio salutare Dei." And wait he did, and in silence.

But at last the time came when he felt that he was summoned to take part in the political movements of his time. The interests of the Church were in danger. In spite of all efforts to check it, the liberal movement had reached the Papal States, and the people, no longer content with the government of princes responsible only to God, were vigorously demanding a constitution, which Pius IX., new to his dignity, seemed not indisposed to grant. Rosmini was an ardent believer in constitutional government; but he had a terrible dread and hatred of constitutions modelled on the French type. Accordingly, though steadily refusing to present himself in Rome, on the ground that neither the Lord nor the Pope had unmistakably called him, he willingly yielded to the request of Cardinal Castracane to draw up a plan of a constitution to be presented to the Pope for consideration. This document was finished and sent off on the 10th of March, but arrived too late to be of service. Pius IX., amid the cheers of Europe, had already granted a constitution, containing many of the provisions of which Rosmini had but too well foreseen the results. Rosmini, however, was not discouraged. He felt that he was called to act, and he acted. He rewrote, in a somewhat enlarged form, his unaccepted plan for a constitution, and published it under the title: *Constitution in accordance with Social Justice, with an Appendix on the Unity of Italy*.¹ This was followed by his *Five Wounds of Holy Church*,² a work written over sixteen years before. The aim of the former was to dissuade the Italians from adopting a constitution on the French model, to encourage the preservation of existing monarchies and dignities, and to combat republicanism. It is, in two respects, a most noteworthy production—first, as being the well-pondered work of one of the most gifted, honest, and unselfish men, and one of the truest Catholics, that ever lived, and, second, as, therefore, showing us the very best we could ever hope to obtain from Catholics, should they at any time regain their ascendancy in politics. It consists of five divisions or titles (*titoli*), preceded by an introduction, treating of the vices incident to constitutions of the French type and the remedies for them. Of these vices we may mention three—first, the tendency to encourage in all citizens an immoderate ambition to rise in society; second, the failure to guarantee the distribution of property, large and small properties having equal representation; and, third, the abandoning of religion

(1) *La Costituzione secondo la Giustizia sociale, con un' Appendice sull' Unità d'Italia*. Milano. Radaelli, 1848.

(2) *Le cinque Piaghe della Santa Chiesa, Trattato dedicato al Clero Cattolico*. Lugano, 1848; Perugia, 1849.

to the tender mercies of political interests, and depriving the Church of her liberty, "which is the most precious of all the liberties of the people." Of the five titles into which the constitution is divided, the first treats of the fundamental principles of the State; the second, of the king (or president); the third, of the rights of citizens; the fourth, of the legislative chambers; and the fifth, of courts of justice. Of the articles under Title I., the first reads: "The rights of nature and reason are inviolable for every man." On which the second is a strange commentary; it runs: "Liberty of action is guaranteed to the Catholic Church; direct communication with the Holy See in matters ecclesiastical cannot be interfered with; councils are a matter of right; the election of bishops shall belong to the clergy and people, according to the ancient discipline, the Supreme Pontiff reserving to himself the right of confirmation." Title II. provides for a constitutional king of good type. Title III. secures to all citizens equality before the law, personal liberty, inviolability of domicile, protection of property of all kinds, including literary, and the right of appealing to the legislature, as well as of holding public meetings for all purposes not immoral or irreligious. Liberty of instruction and of the press are guaranteed; but "a law represses the abuse of it," and "the Church reserves the right of imposing a censure (on works printed), not involving any penal action on the part of the State." The article securing liberty of instruction is really meant to secure it mostly to the clergy; "the civil authority is incompetent in such matters."

Title IV. provides for a legislative body representing taxable property—wealth, and wealth alone. There are to be two houses, one elected by the larger, the other by the smaller, proprietors. Deputies are to be chosen by electoral colleges, the number and individual wealth of whose members are to be to each other in inverse ratio, so that a single person, paying the requisite amount of taxes, may alone form a college and elect himself, and a million of persons, owning nothing but the labour of their hands, must count for nothing. Indeed, labour, whether of head or of hand, has no representation. Plenty of provision here for the preservation of wealth and poverty, for the exercise of lordly condescension and pious charity, on the one hand, and of servile humility and self-abasing mendicancy on the other! If those essential elements of Catholic civilisation must be perpetuated, no better programme for that purpose could be found than Rosmini's *Constitution*. And the best of it is yet to come. Not only are the poor to be excluded from all share in legislation, but no non-Catholic can sit as a deputy in either house. An article (57) provides that all deputies must be Italians, and this is interpreted to mean that they must be Catholics, on the ground that Italy is a Catholic country. The arguments by

which Rosmini tries to justify this manifest injustice are pitiable, contemptible, Jesuitical beyond all expression or belief. One cannot read them without feeling that his moral sense is insulted, and nothing prevents him from throwing away the book in utter disgust, except the conviction that the blame rests not with Rosmini, but with the cruel, crazing, diabolical untruth, which, like the juice of cursed hebenon, had been instilled into his ears from infancy. He had been taught to believe that the world was made for Catholics, and he had closed his eyes and believed it. He had been told that infidels, be they ever so learned and honest, are, at best, only victims of "invincible ignorance," inflicted on them by eternal justice for daring to be learned and to deal honestly with themselves—objects of pity, to be simply tolerated "with plenitude of charity" (*con pienezza di carità*); and that, too, he had believed. What theories of human justice can we expect from men once bamboozled into believing such manifest, monstrous lies, even about God himself? And yet such believing is held to be pious!

Finding nothing very new or remarkable under Title V., we take leave of this strange document, with a feeling in our hearts that Italy is most warmly to be congratulated on having escaped the application of such an inhuman instrument. Poor, noble, long-suffering Italy! she has had many scourges; but this double, inevitable, perpetual scourge of supercilious wealth and power, twisted, knotted, and consecrated by pompous, irresponsible supernaturalism, this constitution not according to, but contrary to, justice, social and of all other kinds, would have been the direst of all.

If for Rosmini's *Constitution*, with its declared purpose of delivering over Italy, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of popes and princes, we have only words of pity and strong condemnation, we have something different for his other political pamphlet, *The Five Wounds of Holy Church*. If Rosmini, in his heart, desired to see Italy and all the world subject to the Church, he, at all events, desired that the Church should be worthy to rule. Inasmuch, moreover, as he was not at all blind to the fact that she was then very far from such worthiness, he did what in him lay, honestly and fearlessly, to reform her. Regarding, with mysticism sufficiently familiar, the Church as the body of Christ, he finds it pierced in hands, feet, and side, with five wounds. These wounds are due mainly to feudalism and its unjust refusal to recognise the freehold tenures of the Church. By claiming these as fiefs, the feudal lords not only placed the bishops personally in the position of dependants and vassals (wound in the left foot), but also, naturally, claimed the right of nominating them (wound in the right foot). In this way, the bishops, attached to the courts of different princes and dependent upon their favour, became involved in worldly affairs and jealous of

their own their lord's dignity, so that, forgetting their spiritual calling and union in the body of Christ (wound in the side), they became separated both from the lower clergy and from the people. The former, therefore, remained without instruction (wound in the right hand), and the latter, left entirely to their care, soon ceased, from want of teaching, to comprehend the meaning of even the acts of public worship, and, not understanding the language employed in them, became mere spectators of a dumb show (wound in the left hand). Distressed at the sight of these wounds, Rosmini calls for the restoration of the state of things which existed before the rise of feudalism, freedom of Church property, restitution to the clergy and people of the right to nominate their own bishops, frequent communication, through synods and councils, of the bishops with each other and with the Holy See, instruction and education of the lower clergy by the living voice and daily example of the bishops, instead of by poor seminaries and dry, heartless compends of dogmatic lore, and, finally, instruction of the laity in the doctrines of their faith, and the banishment of the Latin language from the services of the Church.

Though Rosmini's picture of the pre-feudal Church is one-sided enough, and therefore false, there is much in his pamphlet deserving of the highest praise, and we may readily believe that Pius IX., before he became afraid of truth and common sense, read it with pleasure and approbation. But we must never forget Rosmini's standpoint, which was that of an absolutely sincere and ardent Christian, believing that the kingdoms of this world were to become the kingdoms of Christ. Which to him meant that they were all to become subject to the Pope as their moral head, to Rome and to Italy. What he aimed at, therefore, was nothing less than the entire separation of Church and State in all countries in which the pope was not temporal as well as spiritual ruler, and the consolidation of the Church, as an independent international commune, divinely deputed to subdue the nations and bring them under the yoke of Christ; that is, of the Pope. In all this Rosmini was but the loyal and consistent son of the Church, the dangerous absurdity of whose claims and purposes is concealed only by their familiarity and antiquity.

That Rosmini, in demanding that the Church should be made independent of the State, did not mean, at the same time, that the State should become independent of the Church, is plainly shown by his almost passionate advocacy of the temporal power of the Pope. Where the Church could entirely control the State, no separation between them was to be thought of; that was the ideal order of things. Those of us who know the Papal States, after their thousand years of Church control, are of a different opinion, and so were their

inhabitants at the time of which we are speaking. As if purposely to give the lie to Rosmini's theories, his two pamphlets had hardly seen the light, when events occurred that showed the utter incompatibility of the duties of a pope with those of a temporal sovereign.

In 1848 all Italy was aflame with the most rational desire for freedom and unity. Piedmont was struggling with all her might to expel the Austrians from Lombardy, and calling to her sister states for countenance and aid. The temper of the people of these states promised both, and the Papal troops, under General Durando, had already crossed the frontier into Lombardy, when the Pope, in an allocution of the 29th April, disclaimed all responsibility for this movement, saying that it had taken place contrary to his commands, and announced his resolution of taking no part in the war. "Being the vicar on earth of Him who is the author of peace and lover of charity, and protecting and embracing, in virtue of His supreme apostolate, all tribes, peoples, and nations, with equal zeal and paternal love" (these were his words), he could not make war on any one of them. In other words, his apostolate forbade him to perform one of the most essential duties of a prince. The exasperation which this allocution called forth throughout Italy was intense. The bitterest reproaches were everywhere launched against the Holy See, as the great obstacle in the way of freedom and unity. Even Rosmini, who was a firm believer in a united Italy, felt that a false step had been taken, and lost no time in letting the Pope know his opinion. The letters which he wrote at this time to his friends in Rome, with orders to show them to the Pope, if here and there betraying a most undiplomatic faith in princes' sense of justice, leave little to be desired in the matter of vigour and plain speaking. In one he pointed out, in the most lucid terms, that the Pope, by refusing to take part in a war at once just and useful to the nation, had gone far to prove to all the world that the duties of a pope were irreconcilable with those of a prince, and had thereby most seriously jeopardised his temporal authority. Being suspicious of the policy of Piedmont, he went on to advise the Pope to unite with the princes of Naples and Tuscany in sending a collective note to the Emperor of Austria, politely requesting him to withdraw from Italian territory. The argument used to induce the foreign potentate to accede to this request was, that Italy was so incensed at Austrian misgovernment, that unless they, the subscribers, united with Lombardy and Piedmont in endeavouring, by armed force, to put a stop to it, they would lose their crowns, and the people proclaim a republic, "greatly to our disadvantage (*danno*) and that of all Europe." In a second letter he pointed out the evil consequences of the Pope's double-faced policy in disclaiming the action of his troops and yet doing nothing to prevent it. Having, moreover, on mature reflection, discovered that the argument of his previous letter was

likely to produce little of the desired effect on the Austrian emperor, he suggested another; one stronger indeed, but one which throws a very sinister light upon ecclesiastical diplomacy, and even upon Rosmini himself.

"I am convinced," he says, "that a Cardinal Commendone, or some other of those politicians of large views, of whom Rome in other times could boast, would, under the present circumstances perhaps (*sic*), suggest to the Pope the propriety of frankly assuming the guardianship (*tutela*) of nationalities in general, and of the German nationality in particular, in order to counterbalance the zeal which he is obliged to display for Italian nationality; would persuade him to send agents to Germany with wise instructions (whatever character it may seem fit to give them) to claim as a merit on the part of the Holy See the protest which it made in 1815 against the abolition of the German Empire and to signify its readiness to countenance the establishment of a new empire in Germany and to further the same by its influence with the Catholics of that nation. In view of the proposed re-establishment of such an empire in Germany, it appears to me that the Holy See cannot remain indifferent or inactive—the Holy See, which had so much part in the old German Empire, whose memories and traditions still remain in Germany, that nation so tenacious of its former customs. It is beyond measure important for the interests of religion, that, if a new German Empire arise, as is highly probable, its Emperor should be a Catholic. Here there is an excellent chance for the Pope to show himself favourable to Austria, by holding out the hope that he will use all his influence to second her claim to the headship of the new empire. I believe, the simple suggestion that the Pope would be willing to go in person to Frankfort, to crown with his own hand a Catholic Emperor of Germany, would have a good effect on all Germany and especially on Austria, and I am entirely certain that if it could really be brought to pass, that the Pope should ever go to Germany for such a purpose, the advantages resulting to religion would be incalculable. In a word, if there is any way in which the mediation of the Pope in the affairs of Italy promises any hope of success, it can only be by awaking in Austria the hope that the Pope might perhaps (*sic*), by his influence, compensate her in Germany for what she would lose in Italy."

A painful document enough, coming from an honest man, and a man who did nothing without Divine prompting! It reveals to us plainly what Catholics mean by the moral supremacy of the Pope. Whenever it suits the interests of religion, he is to send agents, with "wise instructions" to use his spiritual influence in the temporal affairs of foreign nations. Poor Germany! she never knew what she missed! Her Protestant citizens were to be made subjects of a Catholic emperor, in order that the princes of Italy might not lose their crowns. Moreover, the Pope was to go in person to Frankfort and crown the new potentate, emperor by the grace of God. And only thirty-three years have passed since such things were thought possible, and even probable!

Though endeavouring by letters to influence the Pope, Rosmini had thus far declined all invitations to go in person to Rome. Now, however, there occurred an opportunity of presenting himself there with prestige and authority, which Divine prompting told him might

be used for the benefit of the Church. Hostilities were still going on between Piedmont and Austria, and the former was bitterly feeling the need of the assistance of all Italy, in order to bring them to a successful conclusion. A league between the princes of the more important states had been talked of; but, owing to a selfish condition imposed by the Pope, nothing had so far come of it. Now, however, the necessities of the war demanded immediate co-operation, and Piedmont, willing to yield all possible points in order to induce the Pope to lend his countenance and aid, resolved for that purpose to send Rosmini, whose character and recent political pamphlets were well known, as Ambassador Extraordinary to Rome. Rosmini at once accepted the mission, with the vague understanding, however, that his duties were not to be confined to the immediate purpose in view. "If full powers were given him to deal with all matters which he might deem necessary or conducive to the welfare of Italy and of the Church," he would accept, otherwise not. The Ministry wisely hesitated to confer powers so extensive and indefinite; but Rosmini's old philosophical adversary, Gioberti, by threatening to resign if they did not, overcame their scruples. Rosmini then, without any definite instructions, or clear understanding with the Ministry, after visiting King Charles Albert at Vigevano, at once set out for Rome, which he reached on the 15th of August.

Rosmini's mission to the Holy See was, we need hardly say, worse than unsuccessful. The grounds of this are by no means difficult to discover. His position was a difficult one. The Piedmontese Government desired one thing, and Rosmini, its Ambassador, was firmly resolved to accomplish, if possible, another. What the former wanted was immediate moral and military aid; what the latter wished to bring about he had clearly stated in his *Constitution*. "Let us," he had written, "use every effort to establish a prudent and strong confederation of the peoples and princes of Italy, beginning with Piedmont, Tuscany and Rome; let the permanent Diet have its seat in Rome, and let its moral presidency be vested in the Pope. But first, and as a preamble, let us conclude a reasonable concordat with the Holy See." Two very different things!

Rosmini had left Turin without his credentials, and the Ministry, discovering, apparently, that it had made a mistake in sending him to Rome, was in no hurry to forward them. In spite of this, Rosmini, armed with an autograph letter which he had received from Charles Albert, at once asked and obtained an audience of the Pope. The Holy Father received him most graciously, and told him he meant to put him in prison. The meaning of this became apparent when, three days after, he sent word to Rosmini to prepare himself for the Cardinalate. Meanwhile, at Turin the Casati Ministry, which had appointed Rosmini, had undergone certain changes,

which made the breach between it and him even wider than before. General Perrone, the new Minister of Foreign Affairs, immediately on his appointment, sent instructions to Rosmini to drop the question of confederation, and try to bring about a political alliance. "Rosmini understood perfectly that the cards were going to be changed in his hand; but he had not the heart to abandon the Holy Father in this most perilous emergency." So says his biographer. The fact was that Rosmini chose deliberately to disobey the instructions of his Government, and to adhere to his own purpose of effecting a confederation, with the Pope as perpetual president. For this purpose he held repeated conferences with the representatives of Rome and Tuscany, and even drew up the plan of a federal constitution, which he forwarded to the Ministry at Turin. In a word, he did everything to defeat the purpose of his mission, which, it is quite evident, was by no means difficult of attainment. Vexed at his conduct, but unwilling to recall a representative so acceptable to the court of Rome, the Turin Ministry left him for a considerable time without further instructions. When at last he received orders to confine his efforts to the effectuation of a warlike league, he protested and resigned. His mission lasted, in all, seven weeks.

The reasons of Rosmini's invincible opposition to a league of princes, whether political, or merely military, are very evident. Such a league would have involved what were to him three capital defects. (1.) It would have left the balance of power in the hands of Piedmont, and even increased it, had Italy under her leadership proved successful in opposing the Austrians. (2.) Not being binding upon the people, it would have been liable to overthrow at any moment by a popular movement in favour of republicanism, or any other respectable form of liberal government. And (3.) It would not have enabled the Pope, by shifting upon others' shoulders the responsibility of declaring war, to reconcile his princely and pontifical duties. A confederation of states, on the other hand, with a Diet sitting in Rome, and the Pope as its *ex-officio* president, would at once have given a preponderance of power to the Church, been binding upon the people, whose movements might then have been repressed by federal troops, and, inasmuch as the power of making war would be in the hands of the Diet, have allowed the Pope to engage in hostilities, and yet at the same time, without diminution of unction, proclaim himself the "author of peace and lover of charity, embracing and protecting with equal zeal and paternal love all the tribes, peoples, and nations of the earth." Most manifest advantages!

Relieved of his civil functions, in the exercise of which he had done nothing but prove his undivided allegiance to the Holy See, Rosmini found himself in his true position, free to devote himself to

the Pope, and prepare for the Cardinalate. And, indeed, the Pope needed all the devotion he could command. Matters in Rome were rapidly approaching a crisis. Pellegrino Rossi, to whom, on Rosmini's recommendation, the Pope had blindly intrusted the conduct of public affairs, was behaving dictatorially, at the same time unfairly incurring the odium of the people, as the main cause of the Pope's inactivity. We say, unfairly, because the real cause of this inactivity was Rosmini, who persuaded the Pope to insist on a confederation and concordat with Piedmont as the price of his co-operation during the war. Rossi, on the contrary, favoured the conclusion of a provisional league, which, considering the pressing necessities of Italy, was the only thing feasible. Rosmini, disappointed at meeting opposition to his scheme in this unexpected quarter, did his best to diminish Rossi's influence over the Pope, and the latter, not knowing how to choose between the two, resolved to add Rosmini to the Rossi Ministry as Secretary of State. The execution of this purpose was frustrated by the brutal assassination of Rossi, who fell a victim to the misdirected resentment of the people, almost before Rosmini's eyes. This untoward event took place on the 15th of November, and on the following day the people besieged the Quirinal Palace, demanding that the Pope should at once appoint an active Ministry, and naming the men they desired. Among these was Rosmini, of whom they could have known nothing except the fact that he was Ambassador Extraordinary from patriotic Piedmont, sent to induce the Romans to go to war. Had they known his views and the influence he had exerted, he would probably have shared the fate of Rossi. The Pope turned a deaf ear to the reiterated demands of his excited subjects, until these brought a cannon to Monte Cavallo and made preparations to send a ball from it through the gates of his palace. Then at last he yielded, and appointed the Ministry demanded, with Rosmini as President and Minister of Public Instruction. Late the same evening, Rosmini, living close by, at the Palazzo Albani, received notice of his appointment; but, feeling that it placed him in a false position with the people, and fearing that it had been made under popular pressure, he hesitated to accept it, and, hastening to the Quirinal, requested an audience of the Pope. The latter, though friendly, gave only evasive answers to his inquiries, and Rosmini, feeling that he was not bound by obedience to accept the appointment, went home and wrote a note formally declining it; after which, thinking it prudent to keep himself out of the way, he betook himself to the French Embassy and afterwards to the Villa Albani, outside the city. Eight days after, the Pope, deprived of his foreign guards, and not feeling his sacred person safe in the hands of his beloved subjects, left Rome in disguise and fled like a hireling to Gaëta, in

the Neapolitan territory. Thither, with permission, Rosmini followed him, a step which he had ever afterwards much reason to regret.

In order to understand what now befell Rosmini, we must look away from the purity of his intentions, his political doctrines and his unfeigned devotion to the Holy See, and consider only what had been the practical effects of his influence with the Pope. They had been the assassination of Minister Rossi and the expulsion of the Pope from Rome. Both these were results of the Pope's refusal to take immediate part in the war of Italian emancipation, and for this refusal Rosmini was partly responsible. Not that he was in principle opposed to the Pope's declaring war; but, wishing to force all Italy into a permanent confederation, presided over by the head of the Church, he encouraged the vacillating Pope to decline entering into the military alliance proposed by Piedmont, and strongly seconded by the Rossi Ministry. In his supreme anxiety for the authority and welfare of the Church, he had, with true philosophical ideality, overlooked the immediate political aspirations of his country, and these had shaped themselves into the grim reality of a popular uprising, which he had no skill to conjure down. Naturally enough, the fugitive Pope, seeing for the moment only the immediate results of Rosmini's policy, and having no policy of his own, turned for counsel to the other men who were about him. Though this pained Rosmini deeply, it did not imply any want of respect or affection for him on the part of the Pope; and, indeed, the personal relations between the two might have continued unchanged, had not other influences interfered. These influences came in the form of strong pressure on the Pope, from two directions—first, from the Papal Court, and especially from Antonelli, who had always been jealous of Rosmini; and, second, from the King of Naples, whose wishes the Pope, as a guest, felt bound to respect. Antonelli, a shrewd, unscrupulous politician, whose voice had always been for immediate war, hated the far-reaching, ideal, temporising policy of Rosmini, and had done his best to prevent him from coming to Gaëta. Now that the turn of events had made him the trusted adviser of the Pope, he used all his influence to get Rosmini entirely out of the way. In this he was strongly seconded by the King of Naples, who was in principle opposed to confederation or union of any kind among the states of Italy, and had, moreover, taken a strong dislike to Rosmini, for claiming, as he had done, both in his *Constitution* and in his *Five Wounds*, that the right of nominating bishops should be restored to the clergy and the people. Rosmini was not slow to feel the effect of these combined influences. Recognising that he was no longer a welcome guest at Gaëta, he obtained the Pope's permission to go on private business to Naples, and left on the 22nd of January, 1849. Whether with self-respect he could have acted otherwise is doubtful;

but certain it is that his adversaries could have desired nothing better. By quitting Gaëta, he left the field open to Antonelli; by going to Naples, he placed himself more than ever in the power of the Neapolitan government. And this he soon found out.

Rosmini remained four months in Naples, during which time the government not only subjected him, through its police and other emissaries, to various kinds of personal annoyance, but also constrained the Pope to abandon his intention of raising him to the Cardinalate, and to sanction a decree issued by the Congregation of the Index, prohibiting his two political pamphlets. In order to obtain this decree, it had secretly engineered an extraordinary and irregular meeting at Naples of a few members of said Congregation. Of this meeting, Rosmini, though a consultor of the Congregation and present on the spot, never received the slightest intimation. Indeed, he did not hear of the decree till nearly three months after.

At last the annoyances at Naples became so frequent and so trying, that Rosmini found himself obliged to leave it and return to Gaëta. Here, however, he met with nothing but cold shoulders, sour looks, and curt replies. With great difficulty he succeeded in obtaining an audience of the Pope, who found himself in a very awkward position. Poor Pius! he was obliged to say to Rosmini that he knew nothing of the behaviour of the Neapolitan government or of his own court, and, though he mentioned that the *Constitution* and the *Five Wounds* were under examination, to conceal the dishonouring fact that he had already sanctioned their prohibition. At a second audience, he behaved in the same disingenuous, pusillanimous way, and advised Rosmini "to retire to Florence till the present ebullition of envious passions should have subsided." Anything to get rid of him! Two days later Rosmini received a note from Monseigneur Stella, informing him that the Holy Father "gave him leave to go where he liked." The details of this unworthy treatment, inflicted at Naples and Gaëta on a man whose only crimes were perfect sincerity and uncompromising loyalty to Catholic principles, reflect most severely on the character of Pius IX., bringing into bold relief his weakness, vanity, untruthfulness, and want of principle. How small a man compared with Rosmini! The latter, amidst all his trials and annoyances, never for a moment lost his serenity, but, even when they were most oppressive, wrote an important commentary on the first chapter of St. John's Gospel!

Rosmini left Gaëta on the 19th of June, and went by way of Capua to Caserta, intending temporarily to fix his abode there; but new difficulties with the police compelled him, in less than a month, to pull up his stakes and quit Neapolitan territory altogether. Having turned his steps to Albano, he was there most hospitably entertained for two months by Cardinal Tosti, bishop of the diocese. There he

received, for the first time, notice of the prohibition of his pamphlets. His conduct on that occasion was highly characteristic, showing the sincerity and wholeness of the man. Though not unaware of the manner in which the prohibitory decree had been obtained, he at once wrote to the Master of the Sacred Palace, expressing his entire submission to it. He even felt a certain satisfaction in having his obedience put to this severe test, and, in that triumphant spirit, wrote to the members of his institute and other intimate friends. After leaving Albano, Rosmini remained in the neighbourhood of Rome till near the end of October, and then returned, by way of Leghorn and Genoa, to his home in Stresa, which he reached on the 2nd of November, after an absence of sixteen months. Thus ended his unfortunate mission to Rome.

We have dwelt at some length on this brief portion of Rosmini's career, because, more than any other, it brings out his true character and aims, and also because it throws considerable light upon a curious episode in the history of Italian emancipation. It shows us Rosmini as an incorruptible, consistent Catholic, bound by every fibre of his nature to the Catholic ideal of a kingdom of God upon earth, and trying with much sincerity and energy, but with little insight into the spirit of his time, to realise the same in society and politics. He failed, and that was not all. His attempt caused the failure of the only other scheme which could have for a time saved the temporal possessions of the Pope. It, therefore, more than defeated its own purpose, and both Italy and the Church are largely indebted to his attempt and its failure for the relative positions they occupy to-day. Rosmini acted according to his conscience, or what he believed to be divine prompting, and he left the issue in God's hands. If that issue proved very different from what he had expected, he had still faith to believe that all was for the best. And so it was.

Restored to Stresa, Rosmini resumed, as serious labours, his philosophical productivity and the care of his institute, varying them with the lighter avocations of walks, hospitality, friendly conversation and letter-writing. The notoriety which his embassy had given to him and his opinions attracted many sincere persons, who, sympathizing with him, sought not only his friendship, but, in many cases, admission to his order. In the six years that followed, during which he rarely left Stresa, he did much to bring his philosophical system to completion, and to extend the usefulness of his institute. Indeed, these years might have been as full of happiness as the eleven that preceded his embassy, but for two circumstances, his own failing health and the bitter malevolence of his enemies. The malady which he had contracted in early life and aggravated by subsequent overwork and neglect, began now to assume menacing forms and to induce the haste which comes from the feeling that one's days are

numbered. At the same time, the influences which had pursued him at Gaëta and Naples, instead of ceasing, continued to work with double force, increased now by that of the whole Jesuit order, whose power both his institute and his philosophy threatened. Indeed, this feline society, recognising that its monopoly of clerical instruction was likely to be seriously interfered with by his institute, and its sensistic, humanity-depreciating theories, by his spiritualistic doctrines, now made itself the chief instrument of his persecution. Accordingly, with a hundred tongues, some whispering, others shouting, it began to circulate the report that Rosmini's published works were full of heresy and all sorts of damnable doctrines. Knowing that the charge of heresy is as readily believed by priestly, as unclean social gossip is by prurient, natures, it did not even take care to make its numerous accusations mutually compatible. Its purpose was, by mere noise, to make the Pope believe that Rosmini was a man dangerous to religion and the interests of the Holy See. What must have been their astonishment to find that, with all their noise, backed by their prestige, they could not make the Pope believe them! Pius IX. had direct knowledge of Rosmini's faith and purposes, such that even Jesuit slander could not make it appear ignorance. Besides, being conscious that he had wronged Rosmini, the Pope, now restored to his throne and free to act, was naturally enough disposed to make what reparation was still in his power. Indeed, his behaviour towards Rosmini, from this time on, was in every sense honourable and praiseworthy. He first enjoined silence on Rosmini's enemies and then caused all his published works, excepting, of course, the prohibited pamphlets, to be subjected to a most minute examination. This examination lasted for nearly four years, and at the end of that time, the Congregation of the Index, with the Pope in person presiding, declared that all the works of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, lately examined, were to be dismissed, as free from censure, and that on account of said examination no obloquy should attach either to their author or the institute founded by him. Such a verdict is the most favourable that the Congregation of the Index is permitted to render. The Pope then enjoined perpetual silence on all Rosmini's enemies, whose baffled fury in consequence knew no bounds, and has not to this day spent itself.

Rosmini's satisfaction was, doubtless, great; but he did not live long to enjoy it. His ever-increasing malady, in spite of the best medical aid, the application of saintly relics and the repetition of innumerable prayers, terminated in death on the 1st of July, 1855. He expired in the midst of numerous disconsolate friends, some of whom had come from a great distance. There is some suspicion that his end was hastened by poison, an attempt having been made some time previous to put an end to his activity in this way. He died as

he had lived, a saint. His remains rest at Stresa, in the vault of the church of the Holy Crucifix, under a handsome marble monument.

Looking back upon the life of this laborious, single-minded Catholic Christian enthusiast of the nineteenth century, however strong our sympathies may be with his personal character and whole-hearted sincerity, we cannot help putting to ourselves the practical question, What was its net result, its harvest of good for the world, for us? Setting aside the involuntary good he did in hastening the political and spiritual emancipation of Italy, we may answer, The spirit of charity which he infused into his institute, and the subtle analysis which distinguishes his philosophical writings.

"The Institute of the Brethren of Charity," such is the full title of the order whose members are better known by the shorter name of Rosminians. Though its constitution demands a novitiate (of two years) and imposes the three monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, its organisation differs considerably from that of all other orders. Its members wear no distinguishing habit, conform strictly to the laws of the country in which they happen to live, and retain a title to their individual property, of which they make a continual sacrifice in accordance with the instructions of their general. The order, as such, owns no property, and claims no special vocation, except to do good to the best of its knowledge and ability. It is unquestionably the most noteworthy attempt thus far made to adapt the principles of Catholicity and monasticism to the circumstances of the present time. If its success has not been marked, this is due, not so much to these circumstances as to the determined opposition which, for thirty years and more, it has encountered at the hands of the Jesuits. In spite of all their efforts, however, the institute is in a fairly flourishing condition, and its members, who are almost exclusively Italian or English, are among the truest Christians and most human-hearted men that Europe can boast of. It has two novitiates, one at Domodossola and one at Rugby, the latter soon to be transferred to Wadhurst, near Tunbridge Wells. It has several colleges and religious houses in various parts of Italy and England. It has, moreover, a branch for women called the "Institute of the Sisters of Providence." The establishment of this branch was largely due to the priest Loewenbruk. It numbers at present about five hundred persons.

But, after all, Rosmini's institute only serves in some degree to soften the asperities of an ancient religious system, which, being in its very essence intolerant, and, therefore, uncharitable, must in time disappear from a world which, in true humanity, has already far outstripped it. His philosophy, on the contrary, though by him used to bolster up many foregone conclusions, the very reverse of

philosophical, contains much that is of permanent value, and deserves to be widely known. Though, in spite of the fact that some of his works have been before the world for fifty years, and many more for over half that time, his name is ignored in even some of the latest histories of philosophy, it may be without fear affirmed that Rosmini's system is, in very many respects, the most profound that has yet appeared and the best adapted for bringing intelligent harmony into the present chaos of conflicting opinions. Before attempting to state wherein the value of his system consists, it may be well to give a list of his chief works :—

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|
| I. Ideology and
Logic. | { | 1. Nuovo Saggio sull' Origine delle Idee, 3 vols. | |
| | | 2. Logica, 1 vol. | |
| II. Metaphysical
Sciences. | { | 1. Antropologia in Servizio della Scienza Morale, 1 vol. | |
| | | 2. Psicologia, 2 vols. | |
| | | 3. Teosofia, 5 vols (never finished). | |
| | | 4. Teodicea, 2 vols (popular). | |
| III. Ethics (Po-
litics, Law,
Education). | { | 1. Principi della Scienza Morale. | |
| | | 2. Storia Comparativa e Critica dei Sistemi intorno
al Principio della Morale. | 1 vol. |
| | | 3. Filosofia del Diritto, 2 vols. | |
| | | 4. Filosofia della Politica, 1 vol. | |
| | | 5. Del supremo Principio della Metodica, 1 vol. | |
| IV. Critical. | { | 1. Aristotele esposto ed esaminato, 1 vol. | |
| | | 2. Rinascimento della Filosofia in Italia, 1 vol. | |
| | | 3. Vincenzo Gioberti e il Panteismo, 1 vol. | |

This list does not include any of the smaller essays, any of the numerous ascetical works, any of the letters (10,000 !) or the introductory volume, which is made up of several small works, the most important of which, entitled *Sistema Filosofico*, is a *résumé* of his philosophy, written by himself for an encyclopædic work. His writings, of which only about half are published, will fill about eighty volumes octavo.

We have already stated the aims which Rosmini had in view in writing a system of philosophy, and the means by which he thought they were to be reached. Nothing need be said against either. Had the means proposed been rigorously applied all the expected results might have followed. Unfortunately Rosmini's religious creed rendered him incapable not only of making a free use of his reason, but also of examining and comparing previous systems without prejudice. Hence his principles are frequently assumed in view of foregone dogmatic conclusions, and his treatment of certain great systems is without justification. In spite of his wonted clarity, his manner towards the Germans, and especially towards the noble, fearless Kant, is unworthy and unphilosophical. Since these shortcomings affect particularly his higher and more mediated doctrines, it is upon the fundamental part of his system that his claim to recognition mainly rests. The works that will carry his name down to posterity are his

New Essay on the Origin of Ideas (including the *Restoration of Philosophy in Italy*), his *Logic*, his *Psychology* (including the *Anthropology*) and his *Principles of Moral Science*. In these he labours with great success to keep within the bounds of simple, sane, human reason, to discover its nature, capabilities, and limitations, and to justify its claims to a capacity for knowing truth and to a power of acting freely in accordance with such knowledge.

If we look away from Rosmini's creed-born prejudices, we shall find very little to object to either in his method or his principles. The conditions for successful philosophising he believed to be an extensive acquaintance with the history of human thought, a careful observation and analysis of facts, and a strict adherence to logic in the drawing of general conclusions. These conditions he strove to realise in himself. His knowledge of philosophy, ancient, mediæval, and modern, was perhaps never equalled; in accurate observation and analysis of the processes of thought he stands alone in the history of science; his logic is faultless wherever his assumptions are correct. His method, therefore, was inductive and positive in the true sense of these terms. He accepted the *πρῶτον πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, the data of sense and intelligence to the fullest extent, and endeavoured, by analysis and subsequent synthesis, to work back to the *πρῶτον φύσει*, the ultimate reason of them. Unlike most modern philosophers, who try to explain away common sense, he undertook to justify it and to show that "things are what they seem." For this purpose he sought to demonstrate that most of what is called modern philosophy rests upon an entirely false assumption, which began with Descartes and Locke and continued unquestioned down to Kant and Hegel.

"From Locke to Kant," he says, "philosophy, in spite of all opposing efforts, went ever farther and farther astray, and became ever more and more entangled, until at last men got weary of following, one after another, guides that led nowhere. Hence the schools of our time seem more inclined to narrate the adventures of philosophy, a long, amusing story of the voyages and wanderings of the human mind, than to teach any philosophy. If that subject is ever again to be restored to credit among men, I believe we must once more take up the opinions of the ancients, adapting them, as far as possible, to the method and easy style of the moderns, and giving them a fuller and closer bearing upon human life. Moreover, we must never forget that the schoolmen, now so bitterly reviled, are, after all, the connecting link between the ancient and modern philosophies. For, although towards the close of its history scholasticism became degraded, puerile, and ridiculous, it was not so in the works of its great writers, among whom it may suffice to mention Thomas Aquinas, the prince of Italian philosophers."

In this passage Rosmini states clearly what in his own system he undertook to do to justify ancient and modern thought.

It is impossible within the limits of a short article to give anything like an analysis or *résumé* of Rosmini's philosophy, inasmuch

as it is both difficult of comprehension and expressed in a language by no means familiar to thinkers of our time. Perhaps we might indicate its most important bearings if we were to say that it clearly demonstrates two things, first, that all continuity involves sensation, and second, that all distinction is based on intelligence. Thought, therefore, which involves both continuity and distinction presupposes a being endowed with both sensation and intelligence. The nature of intelligence is treated of in the *New Essay on the Origin of Ideas*, that of sensation in the *Psychology*. By a very lengthy and elaborate analysis Rosmini shows, in opposition to the sensists or associationists, that the mind has one innate form or idea; in opposition to Kant and his followers, that it has only one, which moreover is not subjective, but necessarily objective, and the essence of all objectivity. In other words, the essential characteristic of intelligence is that it has an object; all its other characteristics are dependent on, and derivable from, this one. Sensation, on the contrary, has no object, but only a term, which becomes an object only in relation to intelligence. The essence of objectivity (τοῦ νοητοῦ) is *being* (τὸ ἐννᾶται ὄν), that of sensibility (τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ) is *extension* or *continuity* (τὸ συνεχές). Every object of thought, therefore, is an extended or continuous entity. Whatever the human mind, by mere natural reason, attains beyond this, is purely negative and ideal (*negativo-ideale*)—κενὸν καὶ ἰαλεκτικόν, as Aristotle would say. Such is our knowledge of God and of divine things, whose reality, therefore, we can know only through revelation.

Plato held that every human mind brought into the world with it, in a dim condition, the ideas of all the things which it afterwards came to know in an explicit way through the senses; and Thomas Aquinas laid down that the object of intelligence was common being (*ens commune*). Rosmini united these views. According to him, ideas, though absolutely and comparatively distinct from each other, show this distinctiveness only when they are thrown from the magic lantern of the intellect upon the extended screen of sense. Before this they exist in the intellect only as undistinguished, unextended, latent possibility or ideal being, forming, in this condition, its constitutive object.

Stated in this bald way the doctrine does not seem very clear or very acceptable. It is only when we are shown how it alone of all theories hitherto proposed explains the facts of consciousness that we are induced to consider it favourably and to look for a more congenial statement of it.

It is admitted on all hands that, though we must think things as being in order to think them at all, we do not learn anything of their reality by knowing *that* they are, but only by discovering *what* they are. Being, therefore, is a mere condition of thinking and not

an element of real knowledge. All such knowledge comes through sensation, which implies extension, as being certainly does not. If then we were to say that intelligence, by the mere fact that it is intelligence and subject, has, from the first, as its object the being of the entire universe, or universal being, whose nature (*τί ἐστι*) is subsequently revealed to it through sense, we should be propounding a doctrine at once plainly true and easily understood. It is not so clear that this universal being is ideal and the sum of all ideas, whether realised or possible. But this also may be made clear by means of an example. Let us take the idea of triangle. That this, as pure idea, is unextended, is shown by the fact that we cannot think an extended triangle without adding conditions of size and form that do not belong to the pure idea. But if the idea of triangle is unextended, it cannot become an object of thought. It is, therefore, as such undistinguishable from any other idea, and hence from being. What is true of the idea of triangle is equally true of every other idea. Being, therefore, is the form in which all ideas exist in pure intelligence. But being, as we saw, is not an object¹ of knowledge, it is only a condition of thought. Hence pure ideas, which are all contained in being, do not constitute knowledge; they are only conditions of it, very much in the same sense in which light, containing as it does all possible colours, is the condition of vision. Indeed Rosmini, using a familiar scholastic metaphor, calls being the light of the intellect or of reason.

But being is only one of the conditions of knowledge, the other is sensation. According to Rosmini, pure sensation is only another name for the principle of pure extension. As this is rather a startling doctrine, it may be well to quote his own words with regard to it. In answer to the question, "How can an extended *sensum* (*sentito*, i.e. *αἰσθητόν*) be presented to the soul, which is a simple principle?" in other words, How can the extended be presented to the unextended? he says—

"The terms of this question, when closely considered, so far from implying a contradiction, as at first they seem to do, are the expression of the simple and only truth of the matter. The outcome of which truth is this: the continuously extended cannot exist save in a simple principle, and as the term of its act. If the case were otherwise, it would be impossible to assign any reason for the continuity of the parts in this extended term, since the existence of each part terminates with that part, and does not contain any ground for that of the parts which adhere to it. The ground of continuity, therefore, does not lie in the single parts, but in a principle, and that a simple one, which embraces all the parts at once. Moreover, but for this principle, the very parts of which we suppose the continuous to be made up would vanish the instant

(1) I here and elsewhere use the term "object" in its ordinary sense. In that lent to it by Rosmini, being is the only object of intelligence. Rosmini uses *subject* and *object* in their scholastic and Cartesian sense, which was almost inverted by Kant.

we tried to look for them; for the extended, being divisible *ad indefinitum*, the first parts of it could never be found. Indeed, they do not exist. We cannot, therefore, consider the continuous as an aggregate of parts, and yet every part of it assignable by thought is outside every other, and has an existence independent of every other. Hence the continuous, as a whole, cannot exist otherwise than in a single act of the simple principle which feels it."

It follows at once from this that the primitive parts of any extended entity are not extended, but are of the nature of pure ideas. Space, for example, is made up of unextended, ideal points, held together and rendered continuous by a sensitive principle. Indeed, Rosmini holds that not only all matter (atoms, molecules, &c.), but also space is sensitive, and therefore, to a certain degree, animate. He, of course, therefore finds no difficulty with the doctrine of spontaneous generation, since there is no reason why a number of atoms, uniting their sensitive principles, should not form an animal. The manner in which he shows the existence of animation in every part of the physical world is extremely curious, and there is no doubt that his doctrine on this point enabled him to anticipate many of the results of more recent science. Indeed, his *Psychology*, though perhaps the least known of his works, is a mine of original and highly suggestive thought, in no way affected by dogmatic beliefs.

When Rosmini, in his *Theosophy*, comes to look for an explanation of the origin of ideas and of sensation, he shows himself no wiser than the rest of mankind. Vaguely to attribute all things to the power of an incomprehensible extra-mundal God, is only to borrow a fashionable Sunday cloak for one's ignorance. Of all the assumptions that ever were made, omnipotence is the most reckless and the least useful. What boots it to know that things, in order to be actual, must be possible? What we wish to know is the nature of possibility, and how it becomes actuality, or, to speak in theological language, what could induce omnipotence to do one thing rather than another, or to act at all? It may be paying God a very pious compliment to attribute to Him absolute freedom of will; but those who do so not only deprive themselves of the right to expect an ultimate explanation of things, but deny to God the power of giving one, which seriously interferes with His omnipotence. The truth is, we are in absolute ignorance respecting the ultimate ground of things, and the more readily we admit this, the more honest we are. At the same time the fact that we are incessantly spurred by the desire for absolute knowledge shows that our intellect contains the ultimate idea, and that all we lack, in order to bring it fully into consciousness, is a screen of sense of sufficient dimensions to throw it on. In other words, although intelligence is capable of comprehending the universe, it can do so only by the aid of a universal sense-experience, of a complete acquaintance with nature. This is hardly the result to which Rosmini desired to come; but it is only fair to admit that,

though his philosophy was intended to justify belief in an extramundal, capricious God, and though it does furnish the best grounds that ever have been, or ever can be, adduced for such a belief, all that he has fairly proved by rigorous scientific method may equally well be employed to support the far less wildly improbable and gratuitous hypothesis of the ideal immanence of all power in nature.

The scientific world of to-day is divided between the anxious, allodæmonistic, monistic, Oriental pessimism of Herakleitos and Hartmann and the hopeful, autodæmonistic, Occidental optimism of Demokritos and Tyndall. To the former view, the universe is a self-differentiating unity with one all-causing law; to the latter, it is a self-unifying multiplicity, with as many laws as there are individual entities or atoms composing it. To the former, only relations are permanent; to the latter, only substances. To the former, man's natural tendencies are his fate (*ἡθος ἀνθρώπου ζαίμων*); to the latter, "man is man and master of his fate." These two one-sided views may be united and reconciled by Rosmini's philosophy, which, carefully distinguishing between the intelligible *esse* of the universe and its sensible *percipi*, shows that the former is absolutely one, the latter infinitely multiple; in other words, that the phenomenal universe is the result of the interaction of an infinite number of independent entities or atoms, endowed with sensitivity, and hence with volition and power of action. Behind these entities Rosmini, of course, finds a place for an actual, omnipotent, all-ordaining God. Their behaviour hitherto certainly countenances no such tremendous assumption—rather encouraging us to believe that God is the goal, not the starting-point, of creation.

It is astonishing how readily Rosmini's philosophy lends itself to the expression of the highest truth, and how easily the known facts of the universe fall into its framework. What is more curious still, it completely bridges over the yawning gulf that has hitherto separated metaphysics and physics, and makes the language of the one perfectly intelligible to the other. It shows the two to be mutually complementary. We cannot here enter into the details of Rosmini's moral doctrine, which is perhaps the most original and satisfactory of all his productions, justifying, as it does, our claim to freedom, and showing the true character of that much-disputed possession. Indeed, the present brief account of some of the more salient points of Rosmini's philosophy is not intended to be, in any sense, exhaustive, but merely to call attention to a great system, which, from purely adventitious causes, has hitherto failed to meet with the attention it deserves. The Catholic Church, whose Excalibur it is better fitted than any other weapon to be, has, with that kind of judicial blindness which precedes ruin, belied her own official judgment, by practically rejecting it and allowing her professional

moral assassins to do their loathsome worst by it. That, however, need not prejudice any one who has no interests to defend save those of truth. Rosmini's system, with all its theological drawbacks, is by far the noblest original monument of human thought reared by any one person in modern times, towering above even those of Kant, Hegel, and Comte.

We will close this article with a description of Rosmini's person, as given by his biographer :—

“He was of middle stature, lithe, and, with the exception that the head seemed too large for the body, well-proportioned. His forehead was high and expansive, his hair almost black, his nose somewhat aquiline, his chin slightly protruding, his complexion delicate, his eyes full of fire, softened by an expression of bashful modesty, and his lips wreathed with a perpetual smile of benevolence. His manners, rooted, as they were, in a fine nature carefully developed by home education, were full of ease, dignity and kindness to all persons, of whatever rank or condition in life.”

His portraits fully bear out this description.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.—IV.

A MOHAMMEDAN REFORMATION.

It is with considerable doubt of my ability to do justice to so very difficult a subject that I now approach the most important point of all in this inquiry, namely, the question on which in reality every other depends: "Is there a possibility of anything like general reform for Islam in her political and moral life?"

It is obvious that, unless we can answer this in the affirmative, none of the changes I have been prefiguring will very much affect her ultimate fortunes—neither the solution of her legal deadlock with the Ottoman Caliphate, nor the transfer of her metropolis to a new centre, nor even the triumph of her arms, if such were possible, in Africa or India. These by themselves could, at best, only delay her decline. They might even precipitate her ruin. Islam, if she relies only on the sword, must in the end perish by it, for her forces, vast as they are, are without physical cohesion, being scattered widely over the surface of three continents and divided by insuperable accidents of seas and deserts; and the enemy she would have to face is intelligent as well as strong, and would not let her rest. Already what is called the "Progress of the World" envelopes her with its ships and its commerce, and, above all, with its printed thought, which she is beginning to read. Nor is it likely in the future to affect her less. Every year as it goes by carries her farther from the possibility of isolation, and forces on her new acquaintances, not only her old foes, the Frank and Muscovite, but the German, the Chinaman, and the American, with all of whom she may have in turn to count. If she would not be strangled by these influences she must use other arms than those of the flesh, and meet the intellectual invasion of her frontiers with a corresponding intelligence. Otherwise she has nothing to look forward to but a gradual decay, spiritual as well as political. Her law must become little by little a dead letter, her Caliphate an obsolete survival, and her creed a mere opinion. Islam as a living and controlling moral force in the world would then gradually cease.

In expressing my conviction that Islam is not thus destined yet awhile to perish I believe that I am running counter to much high authority among my countrymen. I know that it is a received opinion with those best qualified to instruct the public that Islam is in its constitution unamenable to change, and by consequence to progressive life, or even, in the face of hostile elements, to prolonged life at all. Students of the Sheriat have not inaptly compared the Koranic law

to a dead man's hand, rigid and cold, and only to be loosened when the hand itself shall have been cut away. It has been asserted that the first rule of Mohammedan thought has been that change was inadmissible, and development of religious practice, either to right or left of the narrow path of mediæval scholasticism, absolutely precluded. I know this, and I know, too, that a vast array of learned Mohammedan opinion can be cited to prove this to be the case, and that very few of the modern Ulema of any school of divinity would venture openly to impugn its truth. Nor have I forgotten the repeated failure of attempts made in Turkey within the last fifty years to gain religious assent to the various legal innovations decreed by Sultan after Sultan in deference to the will of Europe, nor the fate which has sometimes overtaken those who were the advocates of change. I know, according to all rule written and spoken by the orthodox, that Islam cannot move, and yet in spite of it I answer with some confidence in the fashion of Galileo, "E pur so muove."

The fact is, Islam does move. A vast change has come upon Mohammedan thought since its last legal Mujtahed wrote his last legal opinion; and what was true of orthodox Islam fifty and even twenty years ago is no longer true now. When Urquhart, the first exponent of Mohammedanism to Englishmen, began his writing, the Hanefite teaching of Constantinople had not begun to be questioned, and he was perfectly justified in citing it as the only rule recognised by the mass of the orthodox. No such thing as a liberal religious party then existed anywhere, and those who broke the law in the name of political reform were breakers of the law and nothing more. Every good man was their enemy, and if any spoke of liberty he was understood as meaning licence. It was not even conceived then that the Sheriat might be legally remodelled. Now, however, and especially within the last ten years, a large section of godly and legal-minded men have ranged themselves on the side of liberal opinion, and serious attempts have been made to reconcile a desire of improvement with unabated loyalty to Islam. A true liberal party has thus been formed, which includes in its ranks not merely political intriguers of the type familiar to Europe in Midhat Pasha, but men of sincere piety, who would introduce moral as well as political reforms into the practice of Mohammedans. These have it in their programme to make the practice of religion more austere while widening its basis, to free the intelligence of believers from scholastic trammels, and at the same time to enforce more strictly the higher moral law of the Koran, which has been so long and so strangely violated. In this they stand in close resemblance to the "Reformers" of Christianity; and some of the circumstances which have given them birth are so analogous to

those which Europe encountered in the fifteenth century that it is impossible not to draw in one's own mind a parallel, leading to the conviction that Islam, too, will work out for itself a Reformation.

The two chief agents of religious reform in Europe were the misery of the poor and the general spread of knowledge. It is difficult at this distance of time to conceive how abject was the general state of the European peasantry in the days of Louis XI. of France and Frederick III. of Germany. The constant wars and almost as constant famines, the general insecurity of the conditions of life, the dependence of a vast majority of the poor on capricious patrons, the hideous growth of corruption and licentiousness in the ruling classes, and the impotence of the ruled to obtain justice, above all, the servile acquiescence of religion, which should have protected them, in the political illegalities daily witnessed—all these things, stirring the hearts of men, caused them to cry out against the existing order of Church discipline, and inclined them to Reform. On the other hand, as we all know, the invention of printing had caused men to read and the invention of the New World to travel. Moreover, in the fifteenth century the Ottoman Turks, then an irresistible power, were invading Europe, and a new element of contact with an outside world was created, and a new fear. Christendom certainly at that time was in danger of political annihilation, or fancied itself to be so, and the apprehensions of devout persons in Central Europe were roused to a vivid consciousness of impending evil by the thought that this was perhaps another authorised scourge of God.

I will not strain the parallel further than it will bear, but I would suggest that causes somewhat analogous to these are now at work among the Mussulmans of the still independent states of Islam, and that they are operating somewhat in the same direction. The Mussulman peasantry, especially of the Ottoman Empire, are miserable, and they know that they are so, and they look in vain to their religion to protect them, as in former days, against their rulers. They find that all their world now is corrupt—that the law is broken daily by those who should enforce the law; that the illegalities of those who ruin them are constantly condoned by a conniving body of the Ulema; that for all practical purposes of justice and mercy religion has abdicated its claim to direct and govern. They have learned, too, by their intercourse with strangers, and in the towns by the newspapers which they now eagerly read, that this has not been always so, and that servitude is not the natural state of man or acquiescence in evil the true position of religion, and they see in all they suffer an outrage inflicted on the better law of Islam. I was much struck by hearing the Egyptian peasantry last year attribute the lighter taxes they were then enjoying to the fact that the reigning

Khedive was "a man who feared God." At the same time the learned classes are shocked and alarmed at the political decline of Islam and the still greater dangers which stare her in the face, and they attribute them to the unchecked wickedness and corruption with which the long rule of Constantinople has pervaded every class of society, even beyond its own territorial borders. They complain now that they have been led astray, and believe that the vengeance of Heaven will overtake them if they do not amend their ways. In all this, I say, there is something of the spirit which once goaded Christians into an examination of the bases on which their belief rested, and of the true nature of the law which tolerated such great corruption.

Nor must we suppose that any part of this dissatisfaction is attributable as yet to a decay of faith, such as we now witness among ourselves. Islam as yet shows hardly a taint of infidelity. The Mussulman of the present day, whatever his rank in life, believes with as absolute a faith as the Christian did of the period just referred to. With the exception of here and there a false convert or, as a very rare case, an Europeanised infidel of the modern type, there is no such thing as a Mohammedan sceptic, that is to say, a Moslem who does not believe in the divine mission of Mohammed. He may neglect every duty of his profession, be guilty of every crime, have broken every law—he may be the worst and the most depraved of men—or, on the other hand, he may have adopted the language and to a certain extent the tone of thought of Europe, and, a thing far more rare, he may be even a scoffer and blasphemer—still I do not imagine that in his heart he any the less firmly believes that the Koran is the book of truth, or that at the day of judgment he shall be found with those who have escaped Jehannem through their professed acknowledgment of God and of His apostle. I have heard strange stories in corroboration of this from persons whom I could not doubt, and about persons whom all the world knew. Thus, one who was with Fuad Pasha in his last days at Nice, the most European of Ottoman diplomatists, assures me that his whole time was spent in a recitation of the Koran, learning it by heart. Another, who was called the Voltaire of Islam, performed his prayers and prostrations with scrupulous regularity whenever he found himself in private; and a third, equally notorious as a sceptic, died of religious mania. All, too, who have mingled much with Mussulmans must have been struck with the profound resignation with which even thoughtless and irreligious men bear the ills of life and the fortitude with which they usually meet their end—with the large proportion that he sees of men who habitually pray and fast, and who on occasion, at great risk and sacrifice, make the pilgrimage, and with the general absence of profanity and the fact

that an avowal of religion is never proffered apologetically as with us, nor met in any society with derision. These things are, perhaps, not in themselves evidence of belief, for hypocrites have everywhere their reward, but the fact even of hypocrisy proves the general spirit to be one of avowed belief. The truly devout are doubtless rare, but where we find them it is evident that their belief pervades their lives in as strict a sense as it does devout persons among ourselves. It would probably be difficult to point out in Europe men who in the world—I do not speak of ecclesiastics or persons in religious orders—lead more transparently religious lives than do the pious Moslems of the better class whom one may find in almost any oriental town, or men who more closely follow the ideal which their creed sets before them. To doubt the sincerity and even, in a certain sense, the sanctity of such persons would be to doubt all religion. In any case it is notorious that the faith of Mecca is still the living belief of a vast number of the human race, the rule of their lives, and the explanation to them of their whole existence. There is no sign as yet that it has ceased to be a living faith.

Neither in considering its future is it easy for a candid English mind to escape the admission that, for all purposes of argument, the Mohammedan creed must be treated as no vain superstition but a true religion, true inasmuch as it is a form of the worship of that one true God in whom Europe, in spite of her modern reason, still believes. As such it is entitled to whatever credit we may give true religions of prolonged vitality; and while admitting the eternal truth of Christianity for ourselves, we may be tempted to believe that in the Arabian mind, if in no other, Islam, too, will practically prove eternal. In its simplest form Islam was but an emphatic renewal of the immemorial creed of the Semites, and as long as a pure Semitic race is left in the world the revelation of Mecca may be expected to remain a necessary link in their tradition. No modern arguments of science are ever likely to affect the belief of Arabia that God has at sundry times and in sundry places spoken to man by the mouth of his prophets; and among these prophets Mohammed will always be the most conspicuous because the most distinctly national. Also the law of Islam—I am not speaking merely of the Sheriat as we now see it—will always remain their law because it is the codification of their custom, and its political organization their political organization because it is founded on a practice coeval with their history. Lastly, Semitic thought is a strong leaven which everywhere pervades the minds of nations, aliens though they be, who have once admitted it; and it will, not easily be cast out. We have seen in Europe, even in England, a land never brought physically into contact with Arabia, how long Arabian thought, filtered as it was through France and Spain to our shores, has dominated our ideas.

Chivalry, a notion purely Bedouin, is hardly yet extinct among us. Romance, the offspring of pre-Islamic Arabia, is still a common motive of our action, and our poets express it still, to the neglect of classic models, in the rhymed verse of Yemen. The mass of our people still pray to the God of Abraham, and turn eastwards towards that land which is Arabia's half-sister, the Holy Land of the Jews. If then we, who are mere aliens, find it impossible to escape this subtle influence, what must it be for those races wholly or half-Arabian who have for centuries been impregnated with Islam, the quintessence of Arabian thought? Who shall fix the term of its power, and say that it cannot renew itself and live? "Send forth," says a famous English writer, who was also a famous English statesman, "a great thought, as you have done before, from Mount Sinai, from the villages of Galilee, from the deserts of Arabia, and you may again remodel all men's institutions, change their principles of action, and breathe a new spirit into the scope of their existence."

But I must not lose myself in generalities or forget that it is for practical Englishmen that I am writing. To be precise, I see two ways in which it is probable that Islam will attempt to renew her spiritual life, and two distinct lines of thought which according to external circumstances she may be expected to follow—the first a violent and hardly a permanent one, the second the true solution of her destiny.

Among the popular beliefs of Islam—and it is one common to every sect, Shiite and Abadite, as well as Sunite—is this one, that in the latter days of the world, when the power of God's worshippers shall have grown weak and their faith corrupted, a leader shall arise who shall restore the fortunes of the true believers. He shall begin by purging the earth of injustice, fighting against oppressors wherever he shall find them, Mohammedan as well as Infidel, and he shall teach the people a perfect law which they shall have forgotten, and he shall reign over Islam in place of their Khalifah, being called the Mōhdy, or guide. To this some add that he will arise of a sudden in some distant corner of the earth, and that he will march towards Mecca, and that everywhere the blood of Moslems shall be shed like water, and that he shall enter Mecca when the streets shall run with blood. In the support of this coming of the Mōhdy many traditions exist which are held to be authentic by the Ulema. Thus it is related on the authority of Abdallah ibn Messaoud that he heard the Prophet say, "When there shall remain but one day of the days of the earth, God shall prolong that day, and shall send forth from my house a man bearing my name and the name of my father (Mohammed ibn Abdallah), and he shall purify the earth from injustice and fill it with that which is right." The same was heard also by Ali Ibn Abu

Taleb, the Prophet's son-in-law, and by Hadhifat Ibn el Yaman, who relates that this prophecy was delivered by Mohammed one Friday at the Khotbah, or sermon, in Medina. Salman el Faris, another witness, declares that he afterwards approached the Prophet and stood before him and asked him, "From which of thy descendants, O Apostle of God, shall the Móhdy be?" And the Prophet answered, stretching his hand towards his grandson Huseyn, "From this child shall he come."

Besides this general belief, which, though not a positive dogma of their faith, is common to all Mussulmans, the Shiites, always prone to exaggerate and embellish, maintain that the Móhdy's duty is not limited to teaching, guiding, and purifying the law, but also that he shall revenge the blood unjustly shed of the Imams; and they cite in support of this a tradition of Ali ibn Abu Taleb, who thus addressed his son, Huseyn, the same who was afterwards martyred at Kerbela, "I swear to thee, O my son," he said, "I swear by my soul, and by my offspring, and by Kerbela, and by its temple, that the day shall come in which our beards shall be dyed with blood. And I swear that afterwards God shall raise up a man, the Móhdy, who shall stand in our place, the lord of mankind. He it is who shall avenge us, nay, he shall avenge thy blood also, O Huseyn. Therefore have patience. For the blood of one man he shall shed the blood of a thousand; and he will not spare them who have helped our enemies." The Shiites say also that this Móhdy will be no new personage, but that he lives already in the flesh, being no other than the twelfth and last of their recognised Imams, who was born in the year 260 of the Hejira, and whose name was Mohammed ibn El Hassan, Abul Kassem, El Móhdy, Lord of the Command and Lord of Time; and who, while yet a child, disappeared from the world, retaining nevertheless his authority. This Móhdy they expect *when the Turkish rule is in decay*. After accomplishing his vengeance and re-establishing justice he shall rule for an undetermined period, when Jesus, the Son of Mary, also shall come, and the Apostle Mohammed, an apparition which will announce the end of the world.¹

It would seem, therefore, exceedingly probable that out of the religious ferment which we now see agitating Africa some enthusiast will arise who will announce himself as this Móhdy and head an active movement of reform. Already, indeed, two such personages have made their appearance, one in Tripoli, of whom I heard

(1) A remarkable coincidence of prediction, Christian and Mohammedan, has been pointed out to me in Rohrbacher's History of the Church, published in 1846, where by an elaborate calculation based on the Old Testament prophecies he arrives at the conclusion that the Turkish Empire will fall in 1882, the date assigned it also by the Mohammedan prediction quoted in my last paper—that is to say A.H. 1300.

much talk a year ago, and who is now said to be marching to join the defenders of Keruan; and a second quite recently in Soudan. It is not difficult to imagine the kind of reformation such an inspired Guide would preach. Indeed his rôle is marked out for him in the prophecies just quoted. He would purge the earth of injustice with the sword, and, breaking with all authority but that of the Koran, he would seek to renew a kingdom of heaven on the model of Islam militant. It would be a repetition, but on a grander scale, of the Wahhabite movement of the eighteenth century, and, having a wider base of operations in the vast fanatical masses of North Africa, might achieve far more important results. Even without pretending to the rank of an inspired guide, it is certain that a man of zeal and character might in the present crisis easily persuade the Malakite Arabs to reform their moral practice, if necessary to asceticism, by proving to them that they would thus regain their ascendancy in arms. On this basis a reformation would be easy; but it would be analogous to that of the Hussites and Anabaptists in Europe, rather than of the true Church reformation which succeeded these, and would hardly be universal or permanent. I once heard a most distinguished Alem describe the qualifications of one who should preach a reform of this kind:—"The man," said he, "who would persuade us to reform must come, in the first place, of a well-recognised family. He must be either a prince, or a Sherif, or an hereditary saint. This would secure him from a first personal attack on the ground of seeming impiety. He must secondly be an Arab, gifted with the pure language of the Koran, for the Arabian Ulema would not listen to a barbarian; and he must possess commanding eloquence. A reformer must before all else be a preacher. Thirdly, he must be profoundly learned, that is to say, versed in all the subtleties of the law and in all that has been written in commentary on the Koran; and he must have a ready wit, so that in argument he may be able constantly to oppose authority with authority, quotation with quotation. Granted these three qualifications and courage and God's blessing, he may lead us where he will."

The chief obstacles, however, to a reformation of this sort would not be in the beginning, nor would they be wholly moral ones. The full programme of the Môhdy needs that he should conquer Mecca; and the land road thither of an African reformer lies blocked by Egypt and the Suez Canal. So that, unless he should succeed in crossing the Red Sea through Abyssinia (an invasion which, by the way, would fulfil another ancient prophecy, which states that the "Companions of the Elephant," the Abyssinians, shall one day conquer Hejaz), he could not carry out his mission. Nor, except as an ally against the Turk, would a fanatical reformer now find much sympathy

in Arabia proper. The Peninsular Arabs have had their Puritan reformation already, and a strong reaction has set in amongst them in favour of liberal thought. They are in favour still of reform, but it is of another kind from that preached by Abd el Wahhab; and it is doubtful whether a new militant Islam would find many adherents amongst them. The only strong advocate of such views at the present day among true Arabs in Arabia is the aged Sherif, Abd el Mutalleb, the Sultan's nominee, who indeed has spared no pains, since he was installed at Mecca, to fan the zeal of the North Africans. A Wahhabi in his youth, he is still a fierce Puritan; and it is possible that, should he live long enough (he is said to be ninety years old), he may be able to produce a corresponding zeal in Arabia. But at present the mass of the Arabs in Hejaz, no less than in Nejd and Yemen, are occupied with more humane ideas. Abd el Mutalleb's chief supporters in Mecca are not his own countrymen, but the Indian colony, descendants many of them of the Sepoy refugees who fled thither in 1857, and who have the reputation of being the most fanatical of all its residents. The true Arabs are in revolt against his authority.

Again, it is improbable that any enunciation of Puritan reform would find support among the northern races, which are uniformly sunk in gross sensuality and superstition; while Constantinople may be trusted to oppose all reform whatever. Wahhabism, when it overspread Southern Asia, never gained a foothold further north than Syria, and broke itself to pieces at last against the corrupt orthodoxy of Constantinople. And so too it would happen now. Abd el Hamid, in spite of his zeal for Islam, would see in the preaching of a moral reform only a new heresy; and, as we have seen, the Mōhdy's mission is against all evil rule, the Sultan's and Caliph's not excepted. So that, unless Abd el Hamid places himself openly at the head of the warlike movement in Africa, and so forestalls a rival, he is not likely long to give it his loyal support. Already there are symptoms of his regarding events in Tunis with suspicion, and on the first announcement of an inspired reformer he would, I believe, not hesitate to pronounce against him. I understand the Turkish military reinforcements at Tripoli quite as much in the light of a precaution against Arab reform as against infidel France.

Puritanism, then, on a militant basis, even if preached by the Mōhdy himself, could hardly be either general or lasting, and its best result would probably be, that after a transient burst of energy, which would rouse the thought of Islam and renew her spiritual life, a humaner spirit, as in Arabia, would take its place, and lead to a more lasting because a more rational reform.

But it was not to such a reformation that I was pointing when I

expressed my conviction that Islam would in the end work out her salvation, nor do I hold it necessary that she should find any such *deus ex machinâ* as an inspired guide to point her out her road. Her reformation is indeed already begun, and may be gradually carried to its full results, by no violent means, and in a progressive, not a reactionary spirit. This only can be the true one, for it is a law of nations and of faiths, no less than of individuals, that they cannot really return upon their years, and that all beneficial changes for them must be to new conditions of life, not to old ones—to greater knowledge, not to less—to freedom of thought, not to its enslavement. Nor is there anything in the true principles of Islam to make such progress an unnatural solution of her destiny. Mohammedanism in its institution, and for many centuries after its birth, was eminently a rationalistic creed; and it was through reason as well as faith that it first achieved its spiritual triumphs. If we examine its bases and its early history, we must indeed admit this. The Koran, which we are accustomed to speak of as the written code of Mohammedan law, is in reality no legal text-book by which Mussulmans live. At best it enunciates clearly certain religious truths, the unity of God, the doctrine of rewards and punishments in a future life, and the revelation of God's claims on man. Psalms, many of them sublime, occupy the greater number of its chapters; promises of bliss to believers and destruction to unbelievers come next; then the traditional history of revelation as it was current among the Semitic race; and only in the later chapters, and then obscurely, anything which can properly be classed as law. Yet law is the essence of Islam, and was so from its earliest foundation as a social and religious polity; and it is evident that to it, and not to the Koran's dogmatic theology, Islam owed its great and long career of triumph in the world. Now this law was not, like the Koran, brought down full-fledged from heaven. At first it was little more than a confirmation of the common custom of Arabia, supplemented indeed and corrected by revelation, but based upon existing rules of right and wrong. When, however, Islam emerged from Arabia in the first decade of her existence, and embracing a foreign civilisation found herself face to face with new conditions of life, mere custom ceased to be a sufficient guide; and, the voice of direct revelation having ceased, the faithful were thrown upon their reason to direct them how they were to act. Revelation continued, nevertheless, to be the groundwork of their reasoning, and the teaching of their great leader the justification of each new development of law as the cases requiring it arose. The Koran was cited wherever it was possible to find a citation, and where these failed tradition was called in. The companions of the Prophet were in the first instance consulted, and their recollections of his sayings and doings quoted freely; while after-

wards, when these too were gone, the companions of the companions took their place, and became in their turn cited.

Thus by a subtle process of comparison and reasoning, worked out through many generations, the Mohammedan law as we see it was gradually built up, until in the third century of Islam it was embodied by order of the Caliph into a written code. The Fakh ed Din and the Fakh esh Sheriat of Abu Hanifeh, the doctor intrusted with this duty, was a first attempt to put into reasoned form the floating tradition of the faithful, and to make a digest of existing legal practice. He and his contemporaries examined into and put in order the accumulated wealth of authority on which the law rested, and, taking this and rejecting that saying of the Fathers of Islam, founded on them a school of teaching which has ever since been the basis of Mohammedan jurisprudence.

Abu Hanifeh's code, however, does not appear to have been intended, at the time it was drawn up, to be the absolute and final expression of all lawful practice for the faithful. It included a vast amount of tradition of which either no use was made by its compiler, or which stood in such contradiction with itself that a contrary interpretation of it to his could with equal logic be deduced. Abu Hanifeh quoted and argued rather than determined; and as long as the Arabian mind continued to be supreme in Islam, the process of reasoning development continued. The Hanefite code was supplemented by later doctors, Malek, Esh Shafy, and Ibn Hanbal, and even by others whose teaching has been since repudiated, all in the avowed intention of suiting the law still further to the progressive needs of the faithful, and all following the received process of selecting and interpreting and reasoning from tradition. These codes were, for the then existing conditions of life, admirable; and even now, wherever those conditions have remained unaltered, are amply sufficient for the purposes of good government and the regulation of social conduct. They would, nevertheless, have been but halting places in the march of Mohammedan legislation, had the destinies of Islam remained permanently in the hands of its first founders. Unfortunately, about the eleventh century of our era, a new and unfortunate influence began to make itself felt in the counsels of the Arabian Ulema, which little by little gaining ground, succeeded at last in stopping the flow of intellectual progress at the fountain head. The Tartar, who then first makes his appearance in Mohammedan politics, though strong in arms, was slow to understand. He had no habit of thought, and, having embraced Islam, he saw no necessity for further argument concerning it. The language of the Koran and the traditions was a science sealed to him; and the reasoning intelligence of the Arab whose dominion he had invaded was a constant reproof to him. He dared not venture his barbarian

dignity in the war of wit which occupied the schools; and so fortified his unintelligence behind a rampart of dogmatic faith. Impotent to develop law himself, he clutched blindly at that which he found written to his hand. The code of Abu Hanifeh seemed to him a perfect thing, and he made it the resting place of his legal reason. Then, as he gradually possessed himself of all authority, he declared further learning profane, and virtually closed the schools. His military triumphs in the sixteenth century sealed the intellectual fate of Islam, and from that day to our own no light of discussion has illumined Moslem thought, in any of the old centres of her intelligence. Reason, the eye of her faith in early times, has been fast shut—by many, it has been argued, blind.

It is only in the present generation, and in the face of those dangers and misfortunes to which Islam finds herself exposed, that recourse has once more been had to intellectual methods; and it is precisely in those regions of Islam where Arab thought is strongest that we now find the surest symptoms of returning mental life. Modern Arabia, wherever she has come in contact with what we call the civilisation of the world, has shown herself ready and able to look it in the face; and she is now setting herself seriously to solve the problem of her own position and that of her creed towards it. In North Africa, indeed, civilisation for the moment presents itself to her only as an enemy; but where her intelligence has remained unclouded by the sense of political wrong she has proved herself capable not only of understanding the better thought of Europe, but of sympathizing with it as akin to her own. Thus at Cairo, now that the influence of Constantinople has been partially removed, we find the Arabian Ulema rapidly assimilating to their own the higher principles of our European thought, and engrafting on their lax moral practice some of the better features of our morality. It is at no sacrifice of imagined dignity, as with the Turks, that Egypt is seeking a legal means for universal religious toleration, or from any pressure but that of their own intelligence that her chief people are beginning to reform their domestic life, and even, in some instances, to adopt the practice of monogamy. The truth would seem to be that the same process is being effected to-day in their minds as was formerly the case with their ancestors. In the eighth century, the Arabs, brought into contact with Greek philosophy, assimilated it by a natural process of their reasoning into the body of their own beliefs; and now in the nineteenth they are assimilating a foreign morality into their own system of morals. Not only in Egypt,—in Oman and Peninsular Arabia generally, there is a real feeling of cordiality between the Mohammedan and his Christian "guest." The abolition of slavery in Zanzibar was a concession to European opinion at least as much as to European force; and a moral sympathy is

acknowledged between a Moslem and a Christian State which has its base in a common sense of right and justice. I have good reason to believe that, were the people of Yemen to effect their deliverance from Constantinople, the same humane feeling would be found to exist among them ; and I know that it exists in Nejd ; while even in Hejaz, which is commonly looked upon as the hot-bed of religious intolerance, I found all that was truly Arabian in the population as truly liberal. Under the late Grand Sherif, Abd el Hamid's reputed victim, these ideas were rapidly gaining ground ; and had it not been for his untimely end, I have high authority for stating that the Mohammedan Holy Land would now be open to European intercourse, and slavery, or at least the slave trade, be there abolished.

There is, therefore, some reason to hope that, were Arabian thought once more supreme in Islam, its tendency would be in the direction of a wider and more liberal reading of the law, and that in time a true reconciliation might be effected with Christendom, perhaps with Christianity. The great difficulty which, as things now stand, besets reform is this : the Sheriat, or written code of law, still stands in orthodox Islam as an *unimpeachable* authority. The law in itself is an excellent law, and as such commends itself to the loyalty of honest and God-fearing men ; but on certain points it is irreconcilable with the modern needs of Islam, and it cannot legally be altered. When it was framed it was not suspected that Mohammedans would ever be subjects of a Christian power, or that the Mohammedan State would ever need to accommodate itself to Christian demands in its internal policy. It contemplated, too, mainly a state of war, and it accepted slavery and concubinage as war's natural concomitants. It did not understand that some day Islam would have to live at peace with its neighbours, if it would live at all, or that the general moral sense of the world would be brought to bear upon it with such force that the higher instincts of Moslems themselves should feel the necessity of restricting its old and rather barbarous licence as to marriage and divorce. Yet these things have come to pass, or are rapidly coming ; and the best thinkers in Islam now admit that changes in the direction indicated must sooner or later be made. Only they insist that these should be legally effected, not forced on them by an overriding of the law. What they want is a *legal authority to change*. Now, no such authority exists, either in the Ottoman Sultan, or in the Sherif, or in any Sheykh el Islam, Mufti, or body of Ulema in the world. None of these dare seriously meddle with the law. There is not even one universally recognised tribunal to which all Moslems may refer their doubts about the law's proper reading, and have their disputes resolved. A fetwa, or opinion, is all that can be given, and it applies only to the land where it is issued. The fetwa of this great

Alem in one Moslem state may be reversed by the fetwa of another in that. The Sheykh el Islam at Constantinople may be appealed against to the Mufti at Mecca or Cairo, or these again, it may be, to Bokhara. None absolutely overrides the rest. Thus while I was at Jeddah there came a deputation of Mussulmans from Bengal, being on their way to Mecca to ask a fetwa on the disputed point whether believers were permitted or not to use European dress. A previous fetwa had been asked at Constantinople, but the deputation was dissatisfied, alleging that the Sheykh el Islam there could not be trusted and that they preferred the Meccan Mufti. Thus legal-minded Moslems who would see their way to improvement are constantly faced with a legal bar, the want of authority. *As things stand* there is no remedy for this.

An opinion, however, seems now to be gaining ground among the learned that a legal issue may one day be found in the restoration to the Caliphate of what is called by them the *Saut el Hai*, the living voice of Islam, which in its first period, and indeed till the destruction of the Abbaside dynasty by Holagu, belonged to the successors of the Prophet. It is certain that in the first four reigns of Abu Bekr, Omar, Othman, and Ali, such a living power to legislate was accorded to the Caliphs; and that on their own authority they modified at will the yet unwritten law. Thus it is related of Abu Bekr that in one instance he set aside a law called the Mota, though based directly on some sentences of the Koran, declaring it not conformable to the better tradition, and that Ali again reversed this ruling, which has, nevertheless, been adhered to by the Sunites. Later, too, the Ommiad and Abbaside Caliphs exercised this right of legislation by deputy; it was in their names that the Mujtaheddin, Abu Hanifeh and the rest, framed their first codes of law; and to the last the words of their mouth were listened to as in some measure inspired utterances by the faithful. It was only when the sacred office passed from the sacred and legitimate House that this feeling of reverence ceased, and the living voice of the Caliph was disregarded in Islam. The Ottoman conqueror, when he took upon him the title of Emir el Mumenin, did not venture to claim for himself the power to teach, nor would Moslems have listened to any such pretension. The House of Othman was from the first sunk in degrading vices, and was too untaught to teach. The account given us by Bertrandon de la Brocquière in the fifteenth century of the court and habits of the "Grand Turk" is evidently no exaggeration; and it is easy to conceive by the light of it how impossible it must have been for the Arabian Ulema to connect the notion of inspiration in any way with such personages as the Sultans then were. As a fact the *Saut el Hai* was not claimed by Selim, nor has it ever been accorded to his descendants.

The want of some voice of authority is, nevertheless, becoming daily more generally felt by orthodox Mohammedans; and it seems to me certain that, in some shape or other, it will before long be restored to general recognition. Abd el Hamid, whose spiritual ambition I have described, has, quite recently, caused a legal statement of his Caliphal rights to be formally drawn up, and it includes this right of the *Saut el Haï*; ¹ and, though it is improbable that the faithful will, at the eleventh hour of its rule, invest the House of Othman with so sublime a prerogative, it is extremely likely that, when a more legitimate holder of the title shall have been found, he will be conceded all the rights of the sacred office. Then the legal difficulty will at last be overcome. The dead hand of the law will be no longer dead, but will be inspired by a living voice and will. Since we are imagining many things we may imagine this one too, —that our Caliph of the Koreysh, chosen by the faithful and installed at Mecca, should invite the Ulema of every land to a council at the time of the pilgrimage, and there, appointing a new Mujtahed, should propound to them certain modifications of the Sheriat, as things necessary to the welfare of Islam, and deducible from tradition. No point of doctrine need in any way be touched, only the law. The Fakh ed din would need hardly a modification. The Fakh esh Sheriat would, in certain chapters, have to be re-written. Who can doubt that an Omar or an Haroun, were they living at the present day, would authorise such changes, or that the faithful of their day would have accepted them as necessary and legitimate developments of Koranic teaching?

It would be an interesting study to pursue this inquiry further, and to see how it might be worked out in detail. The crying necessity of civilised Islam is a legal *modus vivendi* with Europe, and such an adaptation of its law on points where Europe insists as shall suffice to stave off conflict. It is evident that legal equality must now be accorded to Christians living under Mohammedan law, and conformity, on the other hand, in certain points to foreign law that must be allowed to Moslems living under Christian rule. Again, slavery must, by some means, be made illegal; and a stricter interpretation of the Koranic permission be put on marriage, concubinage, and divorce. That all these changes might be logically effected by a process of reasoning from the traditions, and expanding or minimising the interpretation of the Koran no one need doubt who remembers what fetwas have already been given on these very points by some of the Azhar Ulema. At present these decisions are unsatisfactory to the faithful, because those issuing them have no

(1) This claim has been endorsed by Abd el Mutalleb, who is issuing a *Resalat rayiyeh*, or pastoral letter, this year to the pilgrims in support of Abd el Hamid's Caliphate.

authority to strain the law, but with authority the same decisions would meet with general approval. At least such is the impression of modern Mohammedan opinion made on me by my conversation with Mohammedans. It would be interesting to work out these points; and I hope some day to have an opportunity of doing so, but for the present I have neither the time nor the knowledge sufficient for the purpose. I must be content with having suggested the method; I cannot work out the details of a reformation.

It may, however, give an idea of the kind of material in tradition which reformers are looking for, if I quote a document which was being circulated last spring among the Ulema of the Azhar. It purports to be the text of the Prophet's first treaty with the Christians of Arabia, though I do not vouch for its authenticity, and runs as follows:—

“Covenant of God's Apostle, Mohammed, with the Christian people, their monks and their bishops.”—(A.D. 625.)

“Mohammed, the Apostle of God, sent with a message of peace to all mankind, dictateth the words of this covenant that the cause of God may be a written document between him and the people of Christ.

“He who keepeth this covenant, let him be called a true Moslem worthy of the religion of God, and he who departeth from it let him be called an enemy, be he king or subject, great or small.

“To this have I pledged myself: I will fence in their lands with my horsemen, and my footmen, and my allies, throughout the world; and I will care for their safety and the safety of their temples, their churches, their oratories, and their convents, and the places of their pilgrimage, wheresoever I shall find them, whether by the land or by the sea, in the east or in the west, on the mountain or in the plain, in the desert or in the city. There will I stand behind them that no harm shall reach them, and my followers shall keep them from evil. This is my covenant with them. I will exempt them in all matters wherein the Moslems are exempt. I command also that no one of their bishops be expelled from his see, nor shall any Christian be forced from his religion, nor shall a monk be forced from his convent, nor a hermit from his cell. It is my will that none of their holy buildings be destroyed or taken from them for Mosques by my people or for their dwellings. Whosoever despiseth this command is guilty before God and despiseth the pledge of His Apostle. All monks and bishops, and the dependents of these, I declare exempt from tribute, except such as they shall of their free will bring. Nor shall Christian merchants, doing business by sea, or diving for pearls, or working in the mines for gold, or silver, or jewels, even the wealthy and the mighty, pay more than twelve drachmas of yearly tribute. This, for such Christian merchants as shall live in Arabia; but for travellers and strangers in the land, they are exempt. Likewise such as have lands and gardens bearing fruit, and fields for corn, shall pay no more than it is in their power to bring.

“And the people to whom I have pledged my word shall not be required to fight for themselves. But the Moslems shall protect them, asking them neither for arms, nor rations, nor horses for the war, except such as each shall choose to bring. But if any shall bring money, or help the Moslems in war, it must be acknowledged them with thanks.

“And this is my command. No Moslem shall molest a follower of Christ; and if he dispute with him it shall be with good manners. And if a Christian do any man wrong it shall be a duty with Moslems to stay the avenger

and make peace between them, paying the ransom if the wrong demand a ransom. And it is my wish that Christians should not be disregarded by my followers, for I have pledged my word unto them before God that they shall be as Moslems in my sight, sharing and partaking of all things with the rest. And in their marriages they shall not be troubled. No Moslem shall say to a Christian, 'Give me thy daughter,' nor take her unless he be willing. And if a Christian woman become a slave to a Moslem he shall be bound by this covenant to leave her her religion, nor shall he compel her to disobey her religious chiefs. This is the command of God, and whosoever shall deny it and disobey God shall hold him for a liar.

"Moreover it shall be a duty with my followers to repair the churches of the Christians, rendering them the service not as a debt, but for God's sake and for the keeping of the covenant, made to them by the Apostle of God.

"No Christian shall be compelled to go forth in time of war as an envoy or spy against his people.

"These are the privileges which Mohammed, the Apostle of God, hath granted to the followers of Christ. In return he requested them to deal with him and with the Moslems as follows:—

"1. None of them in time of war shall give assistance, either openly or in secret, to the enemies of Islam.

"2. They shall not give asylum in their churches or in their houses to the enemies of Islam.

"3. They shall not help them with arms, or rations, or horses, or men.

"4. They shall not keep counsel with the declared enemies of Islam, nor receive them in their houses, nor deposit money with them.

"5. They shall grant to all Moslems seeking their hospitality entertainment for at least three days. But no Moslem shall require of them to make special cooking for him, and he shall eat of the common food with his host.

"6. If a Moslem seek asylum with a Christian, the Christian shall not refuse to shelter him, and shall not deliver him to his enemies.

"What Christian soever shall refuse these my requests, he shall not partake of the privileges of this covenant which I have made with the bishops, monks, and the rest, the followers of Christ. And I call God to witness with my followers and command them to keep faithful to this my precept, now and till the day of judgment.

"The above was written in the presence of the undersigned persons, dictated by the Apostle of God, and written down by Mawiyeh Ibn Abu Sofian, on Monday, at the end of the fourth month, of the fourth year, of the Hejira, in Medina, peace be upon its Lord.

(Signed)

"ABU BEKR ES SADIK.

"OMAR IBN EL KHOTTUB.

"OTHTMAN IBN AFFAN.

"ALI IBN ABU TALEB.

"And thirty-one other signatures.

"God be witness of what hath been said in this treaty. Praised be God the Lord of the Earth."

In conclusion, I would urge that while it is to Mohammedans themselves that we must look to work out their ultimate regeneration according to the rules of their own law and conscience, Christendom can still do much to influence immediate results. The day of religious hatred between Moslem and Christian as such is, I hope, nearly at an end; and though political strife is unfortunately renewing the old quarrel in North Africa, there is no danger now of its

becoming on Europe's part a crusade. Christendom has pretty well abandoned her hopeless task of converting Islam, as Islam has abandoned hers of conquering Europe; and it is surely time that moral sympathy should unite the two great bodies of men who believe in and worship the same God. England, at least, may afford now to acknowledge Mohammedanism as something not to be merely combated and destroyed, but to be accepted by her and encouraged—accepted as a fact which for good or evil will exist in the world whether she will or no—encouraged because it has in it possibilities of good which she cannot replace by any creed or philosophy of her own. She can do much to help these possibilities, for they depend for the moment on her political action. There is a good cause and a bad in Islam as elsewhere in the world, and though hitherto England's physical help has been given all to evil, it has been through ignorance of the issues at stake; and I am confident that as she learns these, she will acknowledge the wrong she has unconsciously been doing, and repair while there is yet time her error.

In my next and concluding paper I propose to sketch a policy towards Islam worthy of England's high sense of duty and conformable to her true interests.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT.

(To be continued.)

THE KING, IN HIS RELATION TO EARLY CIVIL JUSTICE.¹

WHENEVER in the records of very ancient societies, belonging to races with which we have some affinity, we come upon a personage resembling him whom we call the King, he is almost always associated with the administration of justice. The King is often much more than a judge. He is all but invariably a general or military chief. He is constantly a priest and chief priest. But, whatever else he may be, he seldom fails to be a judge, though his relation to justice may not be exactly that with which we are familiar.

The examples of this association which I will give must be few among many. The monuments of jurisprudence which lay claim to the highest antiquity are those of the Hindus, one of which has long been vaguely known to Europeans under the name of the Code of Manu. Many similar collections of ancient Indian legal rules have of late been discovered, and some have been translated, but it is to be observed they none of them deserve to be called Codes. They are in fact books of mixed law and theology, the manuals in use with the Indian Brahmans in ancient law schools, in which their subjects were no doubt at first taught orally and committed to memory, and were only embodied in writing in comparatively recent times. They are further, as we have them, the result of a sort of literary evolution. The original treatises, or rather bodies of learning, seem to have dealt with all things divine and human (regarded no doubt from a purely theological point of view), but the various portions of this learning became gradually specialised, till at last treatises dealing with law mainly, or law entangled with religious ritual, were finally separated from the rest. In these ancient law books, in so far as they are law books, the authority of a King is assumed. He sits on the throne of justice. He has the book of the law before him. He has learned Brahmans for assessors. Some part of these ideas, like much else of immemorial antiquity, survive in India. A gentleman in a high official position in India has a native friend who has devoted his life to preparing a new book of Manu. He does not, however, expect or care that it should be put in force by any agency so ignoble as a British Indian legislature, deriving its powers from an Act of Parliament not a century old. He waits till there arises a King in India who will serve God and take the law from the new Manu when he sits in his court of justice.

If we pass from the extreme East to the extreme West, from the

(1) A lecture delivered at the Royal Institution.

easterly to the westerly wing of the Indo-European or Aryan race, from India to Ireland, we find this same association. That most interesting system, the ancient Irish law, is known as the Brehon Law, because it is said to have been declared by the Brehons, who are in fact as nearly as possible the Brahmins of India, with many of their characteristics altered, and indeed their whole sacerdotal authority abstracted, by the influence of Christianity. Here, too, we find that the great Brehons are Kings or Kings' sons; and we come upon the significant proposition that, though a King is necessarily a judge, it is lawful for him to have a professional lawyer for an assessor. There are many most striking resemblances, often on the most unexpected points, between ancient Indian and ancient Irish law; and this hint as to the proper constitution of a Court of Justice is one of them.

The ancient Hindu lawyers claimed a descent from supernatural personages only second to the gods. The ancient Irish lawyers pretended that the first of their order was a pupil of Moses in the Desert. But, in point of fact, the order of ideas exhibited by both systems is relatively more modern than that which we can trace in the poems attributed to Homer. Here we can perceive the undeveloped form of the Indian and Irish conception of a Court. The Homeric King is chiefly busy with fighting. But he is also a judge, and it is to be observed that he has no assessors. His sentences come directly into his mind by divine dictation from on high. These sentences, or *θέμνες*—which is the same word with our Teutonic word “dooms”—are doubtless drawn from pre-existing custom or usage, but the notion is that they are conceived by the King spontaneously or through divine prompting. It is plainly a later development of the same view when the prompting comes from a learned lawyer, or from an authoritative law-book.

I pause on one more instance of the association familiar to all of us. The Judges of the Hebrews represent an old form of kingship. The exploits told of them in the Scriptural Book of Judges point to them chiefly as heroes raised up at moments of national disaster; but, independently of the etymology of the name by which they are designated, they were clearly exponents of law and administrators of justice. Deborah, the prophetess, who is counted among them, judged Israel. She dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah in Mount Ephraim, and all Israel came up to her for judgment. Eli, the last but one of the Judges, had judged Israel forty years, and Samuel the prophet, the last of them, expressly claims credit in his old age for the purity of his judgments. On the other hand, the decline of the system is shown by the fact that the sons of Eli are expressly charged with abuse of authority, and those of Samuel with corrup-

tion. In the more mature kingship which presently succeeded, the military functions of the King are most prominent in Saul and David, but the judicial authority again manifests itself in Solomon.

There is one portion of these ancient ideas about justice on which it is necessary to dwell for a moment on account of the great importance which they have proved to have for mankind. It would seem that, in these early times, however much the administration of justice might be organized, even though a system of law-courts might exist competing with the King's justice and quite independent of him, even though all or some part of the law might have been set forth in writing, yet there was always supposed to be what may be called a supplementary or residuary jurisdiction in the King. The law, however administered, was never believed to be so perfect but that the royal authority was always required to eke out and correct it. Just as according to the most modern ideas about jurisprudence, every body of law is thought certain to become an instrument of gross tyranny unless there is somewhere a legislature to amend it, so even that servility to immemorial usage which is characteristic of very ancient times did not exclude the correction of usage by the authority of the King. We owe to this belief in a supplementary judicial authority residing in the King some branches of our own jurisprudence which are in great credit, *e.g.* the so-called Equity of our Court of Chancery; and others of much less repute may be traced to it, such as the old Court of Star Chamber¹ which was established by a belated and therefore unpopular exercise of this same residuary royal power. But a large part of mankind is indebted for much more than this to these ancient notions. Practically at this moment two systems of law divide between them the whole civilised world. One is the English law, followed by nearly all the English-speaking peoples—by ourselves, by all the colonies actually planted by Englishmen, by all the Northern and Central States of the American Union, and to a greater extent every day by the millions of India. The other is the Roman law, whether it take the form, as in Germany, of what we call a common law; or whether it appears under a slight disguise in the French Civil Code, and the numerous codes descended from it. But the real indigenous law of ancient Rome deserved no such fortune as this. It was a stiff system of technical and ceremonious law, belonging to a common and easily recognisable type. But it underwent a transformation through this very residuary or supplementary royal authority of which I have been speaking. The judicial powers of those dimly seen, and half fabulous personages, the Kings

(1) There is no doubt that the Court of Star Chamber was of higher antiquity than the statutes regulating it, 3 Henry VII., c. 1, and 21 Henry VIII., c. 20.

of Rome, descended, at the establishment of the Roman Republic, to the magistrate known as the Prætor; and the old belief in a divine or semi-divine inspiration, dictating judicial rulings to the ancient King, gradually converted itself into the assumption of an imaginary but beneficent law of Nature or body of Equity, guiding the more modern Prætor. Auguste Comte might have appealed to the change as illustrating the transformation of a theological into a metaphysical conception. What has descended to so large a part of the modern world is not the coarse Roman law, but the Roman law distilled through the jurisdiction of the Prætor, and by him bent into supposed accordance with the law of Nature. The origin, therefore, of a body of law, regarded by some of the most civilised societies of mankind as the perfection of reason, and spoken of by continental lawyers with what Englishmen at all events regard as extravagance of praise, is to be sought in this most ancient belief that law, custom, and judicature were all necessarily and naturally subject to correction by the supreme authority of the King.

I wish, however, to speak this evening less of early Kings in general than of the early Teutonic or Germanic King and of his relation to civil justice. Our own Queen Victoria has in her veins the blood of Cerdic of Wessex, the fierce Teutonic chief out of whose dignity English kingship grew; and in one sense she is the most perfect representative of Teutonic royalty, as the English institutions have never been so much broken as the institutions of other Germanic societies by the overwhelming disturbance caused elsewhere by Roman law and Roman legal ideas. But, though this is true, there is no community of which the early legal history is more obscure than ours, much as English and German learning has lately done for it. Fortunately, for an account of the early relations of the Germanic King to justice, we can turn to a monument of ancient Teutonic law constructed at a time when piratical chiefs from Jutland and Friesland were beginning to work the overthrow of the Roman provincial administration in our island. This is the Salic Law, the oldest of the Teutonic codes, the oldest portrait of Germanic institutions drawn by a German. Scholars are now pretty much agreed that it belongs to the fifth century after Christ, and that its preparation was prompted by the great codification of Roman law effected by the Emperor Theodosius II. Nothing is more singular than the delusion, so long and so obstinately entertained in Europe, that the Salic Law either was a system of rules, or at any rate comprised a set of rules, regulating the succession to thrones and crowns. In reality it deals with much humbler matters. It is concerned with the daily life of the men who belonged to the confederation of German tribes called (it is not altogether known why) the Salian Franks. It deals with thefts and assaults, with cattle, with

swine, and with bees, and above all with the solemn and intricate procedure which every man must follow who would punish a wrong or enforce a right. It might be best described as a manual of law and legal procedure for the use or guidance of the free judges in that ancient Teutonic Court, the Court of the Hundred. It is written in phraseology which probably reflects accurately the way in which the Germans of the fifth century spoke Latin. Some of the manuscripts of it contain interlineations in a very old Teutonic dialect which, under the name of the Malberg Gloss, still excite the strongest interest among philologists. With Kings it has nothing whatever to do, except so far as the King is concerned with the administration of justice. The famous passage which was once thought to justify bloody European wars, which caused the war of one hundred years between England and France, and which is still the basis of the theory of politics called Legitimism, merely gives the rule of inheritance to landed property.¹

This Court of the Hundred, which administered the Salic law to the Salian Franks, was the most ancient of the organized Courts among the Germanic races. There were probably "natural" prehistoric Courts which were older, such as the assemblies (or moots) of the various village communities, but the Hundred Court was the result of a deliberate attempt to furnish an alternative to violence and bloodshed, and it seems to have been practically universal among the Germanic tribes. As you perhaps know, it has bequeathed to this country a territorial description, the Hundred, or (as it is called in the north) the Wapentake; and Mr. Gomme, in his interesting volume on *Primitive Folk Moots*, has traced many of the sites at which its open-air meetings were held. They seem to be particularly abundant in Norfolk and in the east of England. The Hundred Court, however, was not an institution which had great vitality in our country, since part of its powers seems at an early date to have gone over to the larger judicial body called the County or Shire Court, while another part went back again to the village communities under their newer name of Manors.

As the Hundred Court appears in the Salic Law, it looks at first sight like an entirely popular tribunal with which royal authority has nothing to do. The judges are all the freemen living within the limits of the Hundred. The President is elective and bears the name of the Thunginus or Thingman. I will say no more of its general characteristics than that it is intensely technical, and that it supplies in itself sufficient proof that legal technicality is a disease

(1) "*De terrâ (Salicâ) in mulierem nulla portio hereditatis transit, &c.*" The word "Salicâ" is certainly an interpolation, as may be seen at a glance from the tabular comparison of the MSS. in the splendid edition of the *Lex Salica* by Mesars. Kern and Hessels (London: Murray, 1880), L. §. 379, *et seq.*

not of the old age but of the infancy of societies. But it has one remarkable peculiarity, that in a large class of cases which come before it, those based on contract or ownership, it does not enforce its own decisions. It may be suspected that, at a still earlier date, this singular inability to discharge what seems to us the most distinctive function of a judicial tribunal extended to all the decrees of the Hundred Court, whatever might be their object. The explanation seems to be that the most ancient Courts deliberately established by mankind were intended to be what we should call Courts of Arbitration. Their great function was to give hot blood time to cool, to prevent men from redressing their own wrongs, and to take into their own hands and regulate the method of redress. The earliest penalty for disobedience to the Court was probably outlawry. The man who would not abide by its sentence went out of the law. If he were killed, his kinsmen were forbidden, or were deterred by all the force of primitive opinion, from taking that vengeance which otherwise would have been their duty and their right.

But at this very point the Salic Law puts us on the trace of one of the greatest services which royal authority has rendered to civil justice. At the first glance, the King appears to have nothing to do with the Court of the Hundred. He is merely represented in it by a class of officers who collect his share of the fines imposed—a very important part of the royal revenues. We find, however, that if the unsuccessful litigant in the Court had agreed to abide by the sentence, the King's officer would enforce it; and even in the absence of such an agreement, if the litigant who had been successful went to the King in person and petitioned him, the King would do him justice in virtue of his ultimate residuary authority. These are the first feeble and uncertain steps of royal authority towards the ascendancy which in all Teutonic countries it has gained over the primitive popular justice. It has dwarfed and finally absorbed this justice, but then it has conferred on it the faculty without which we can scarcely conceive it existing. The King has nerved its arm to strike, and there seems no doubt that the process by which the whole force of the State is employed to enforce the commands of the judge is a result of the contact, ever growing in closeness, between the royal authority and the popular court. We possess in the capitularies of the Frankish Kings some evidence of the further course of these relations between the King and the Court. After a while, the popular president of the Hundred Court, the Thingman, disappears, and his place is taken by the Graf or Count, the deputy of the King. Royal authority is therefore constantly growing, and, as a consequence, we find that the Count will use the King's power to enforce all decrees of the tribunal, without reference to their nature, without previous agreement, and without appeal to the King's supreme

equity. The presidency of the royal officer over the Court was the beginning of a separate set of changes by which the character of the old popular justice was profoundly changed. Everywhere in the Teutonic countries we find deputies of the King exercising authority in the ancient courts, insisting that justice be administered in the King's name, and finally administering a simpler justice of their own amid the ruins of the ancient judicial structures fallen everywhere into disrepute and decay. Such being the well-established consequences of the contact between the Teutonic King and the Teutonic Popular Courts, it seems worth while inquiring what were the weaknesses of those Courts, what seeds of dissolution they contained, and what there was in the King, even apart from this power, which made him their natural successor.

Two forms of authority, the King and the Popular Assembly, are found side by side in a great number of the societies of mankind when they first show themselves on the threshold of civilisation. The Popular Assembly and the Popular Court of Justice are in principle the same institution; they are gatherings of the freemen of the community for different public purposes. The King as *political* chief is contrasted with the Popular Assembly; as *military* leader he is contrasted with the *host*, with the general body of fighting men; with the Popular Court of Justice he is contrasted as *judge*, as depository of the special judicial authority of which I am speaking to-day. I do not enter upon questions now much disputed, whether the King or the Popular Assembly is the older of the two, or whether they have co-existed from all time, and I will merely observe that the tendency of recent research is to assign the higher antiquity to the assembly of tribesmen. Taking it, however, as a fact that the two authorities very generally appear together, we may remark a further law of progress which they seem to follow. In such communities as those of which Athens and Rome are the great examples—in that walled city which was the cradle of a large part of modern ideas—the organs of freedom, as we should say, continually increase in importance. The assemblies monopolise power. The King either disappears or becomes a mere shadow. But in communities spread over large spaces of land, and without walled towns, it is the King who grows, and all popular institutions tend to fall into decrepitude. Are there, then, any reasons for this growth and decay, so far as regards the particular institutions with which we are concerned—judicial institutions? One source of weakness may, I think, be traced in the ancient popular institutions, both judicial and political. This was the great number of men, and the large portion of every man's time, which they required for their efficient working. Even in communities confined by the surrounding wall to moderate dimensions, we can see the difficulty of bringing up the people to the discharge

of their public duties. Scholars will remember the vermilion-stained rope which was dragged along the streets of Athens to force the citizens to the place of assembly, and which exposed the laggard marked by it to a fine; and their recollection will also dwell on the famous fee, the three obols, which was paid for attendance there and at the popular tribunal. Mr. Freeman, speaking of the later revival of Hellenic freedom in the collection of States united by the Achæan League (*History of Federal Government*, i. 266), has noticed the effect which the burden of attendance on political duties had in throwing political privilege into a few hands, and thus in converting democracies into aristocracies. Much of ancient freedom was, in fact, lost through the vastness of the payment in person which it demanded. In communities of the other class, those spread in villages over a great extent of country, the burdensomeness of public duties must always have been considerable, and must have become very great when their size increased through the absorption of many tribes in the same nation. Some evidence of this may be discerned in the importance which old Germanic law assigns to the *sunis* or *essoîn*, a word which once puzzled English lawyers greatly, but which is of old German origin, and really signifies the ground of legal excuse which a man may make for failing to discharge any duty in a popular Teutonic tribunal. But the difficulty is easily understood in another way. Although its pedigree is much interrupted, our English jury is a survival of the old popular justice; yet nobody even now, I suppose, receives a summons to attend a jury with perfect complacency. What, however, must the necessity for attendance have been when the place of meeting was at the other side of the hundred, or perhaps of the county, when there were no roads in England except the Roman roads, when the eastern counties were little better than a fen, and when the Wealden of the south were really forests? Yet there is some ground for thinking that the burden of attendance was lighter in England than elsewhere. On the Continent of Europe, so long as the Hundred Court had a genuine existence, and up to the time when it was converted into a limited Committee of Experts, we cannot trace any relaxation of the severe rule that every man of full age and free must be present. But, even in this particular, the beginnings of that representative system which has done so much to continue the English form of Teutonic liberty in life can be perceived specially characterizing this country. From very early times the English Hundred and Shire Courts were attended not by every freeman, but by the Lords of Manors, and by the Reeve and four men representing each village or parish. Nevertheless there can be little doubt that even in England the duty of attendance was felt to be very burdensome. In the Confirmation of Magna Charta by Henry

III. in 1217, there is a provision that the County Court shall not meet more than once a month; and Mr. Stubbs (*Const. Hist.* i. 605) suggests the explanation that the sheriffs had abused their power of summoning special meetings of the court and fining absentees. He adds that it was the direct interest of the sheriffs to multiply the occasions of summons.

This multitudinousness, if I may so describe it, of all Courts of Justice except those of the King, lasted far down into the feudal period. Feudalism attained its greatest completeness in France, and French historians are astonished at the number of persons who were required for the organization of a feudal Court of Justice. The principle is expressed in a phrase familiar to us, that every man must be tried by his peers, which originally meant that his judges were the entire body of persons standing in the same degree of relation with himself to some superior above. If a great vassal of the Crown had to be tried for treason or felony, all the great vassals of the French Kings must assemble from all parts of the territories of which the French King was the overlord; and it was precisely such a Court which deprived our King John of the fairest provinces of France. If, on the other hand, a villein had to be tried, his peers were the villeins of the same seigneurie. The inevitable result was that the French feudal Courts dwindled into bodies which confided all active duties to a small committee of experts, and as these experts were for the most part devotees of the Roman law, they exercised memorable influence in diffusing notions of the absolute power of the King, and specially of his rightful authority over justice. *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem* — this was the central principle of the developed Roman jurisprudence.

It may thus be believed that the ancient Germanic Popular Courts, and probably the Popular Courts of many other societies, fell into disfavour or decay, as communities of men grew larger by tribal intermixture, through the multitude of judges they included, and through the great difficulty of discharging judicial functions. The freeman who ought to have attended preferred to stay at home, sending his excuse or *essoin* for the neglect, and submitting to a fine if it were insufficient. The tribunals were thus ever changing into committees of legal experts, with a strong bias towards royal authority. Meantime we know from other evidence that the King and the King's justice were ever growing at their expense; and we may ask ourselves whether there was anything in the royal office and functions which gave them an advantage in this competition with the Popular Local Courts. The story of the struggle is far too long and intricate to be told here; but the habits of the King gave him one advantage which there is some interest in pointing out, all the more because it is often overlooked. I do not suppose that, when

a litigant put himself from the first into the King's hands, or appealed to the King over the head of the popular tribunal, he went to some royal residence, palace, or castle. This would have been an aggravation of the difficulties of the popular local justice. It was not the litigant who went to the King, but the King who came to the litigant. I believe upon a good deal of evidence that these ancient Kings were itinerant, travelling, or ambulatory personages. When they became stationary, they generally perished. The primitive Kings of communities confined within walls, like the old Athenian and the old Roman Kings, soon dropped out of sight. Perhaps, as Mr. Grote has suggested, they lived too much in full view of their subjects for their humble state to command much respect when the belief in their sacredness had been lost. But the more barbarous King of communities spread over a wide territory was constantly moving about it; or, if he did not, he too perished, as did the Kings called the *rois fainéants* of the Franks. If I were called upon to furnish the oldest evidence of these habits of the ancient King, I should refer to those Irish records of which the value is only beginning to be discerned, for, whatever may be said by the theorists who explain all national characteristics by something in the race or the blood, the most ancient Irish laws and institutions are nothing more than the most ancient Germanic laws and institutions at an earlier stage of barbarism. Now, when Englishmen like Edmund Spenser first began to put their observations of Ireland into writing at the end of the sixteenth century, there was one Irish practice of which they spoke with the keenest indignation. This was what they called the "cuttings" and "cosherings" of the Irish Chiefs, that is their periodical circuits among their tenantry for the purpose of feasting with their company at the tenants' expense. It was, in fact, only a late survival of common incidents in the daily life of the barbarous Chief or King, who had no tax-gatherers to collect his dues, but went himself to exact them, living as a matter of right while he moved at the cost of his subjects. The theory of the Irish law was, though it is impossible to say how far it corresponded with the facts, that the Chief had earned this right by stocking the clansman's land with cattle or sheep. We find a highly glorified account of the same practice in ancient records of the life and state of those Irish Chiefs who called themselves Kings. "The King of Munster," says the *Book of Rights*, "attended by the chief princes of his kingdom, began his visits to the King of Connaught, and presented to him 100 steeds, 100 suits of military array, 100 swords, and 100 cups; in return for which the said King was to entertain him for two months at his palace at Anachan, and then to escort him to the territories of Tyrconnell. He presented to the King of Tyrconnell 20 steeds, 20 complete armour, and 20 cloaks, for which the said King supported

him and the nobility of Munster for one month, and afterwards escorted him to the principality of Tyrone." The King of Munster is then described as proceeding through Tyrone, Ulster, Meath, Leinster, and Ossory, everywhere bestowing gifts on the rulers, and receiving entertainment in return. I suspect that the entertainment is of more historical reality than the royal gifts. The practice, however, described with this splendour by the chronicler or bard, is plainly the same as the cutting and coshering which Spenser and others denounce as one of the curses of Ireland.

There is reason to believe that the English Kings itinerated in the same way and mainly for the same purpose. The "Eyres" of the Anglo-Saxon Kings are described by Palgrave in his *Rise of the English Commonwealth* (i. 286). The lawyer might suspect the continuance of the practice from the comparative obscurity of some of the places at which some of the most permanently important of our old statutes were enacted—Clarendon, Merton, Marlbridge, Acton Burnell. The novel-reader comes upon a survival of it in *Kenilworth*, for the progresses of so late a sovereign as Elizabeth were certainly descended from the itinerancy of her predecessors. But there is other evidence of a rather remarkable kind. Two historical scholars, Mr. Eyton and the late Sir T. Duffus Hardy, have constructed from documentary testimony accounts of the movement from place to place, during a long space of time, of two of our English Kings, King Henry II. and King John. Neither of them of course is a very ancient King, and in both there may have been a certain amount of native restlessness, but their activity, though it may have been excessive, was certainly not a new royal habit. I take the movements of King John for notice to-day, because his reign makes an epoch not only in English political but in English judicial history. Sir Thomas Hardy's *Itinerary of King John* gives the places at which that King is found to have stayed during every month of every year from 1200 to 1216, the regnant year then beginning on Ascension Day. I take almost at a venture May of 1207. On the 1st of May the King is found at Pontefract, on the 3rd at Derby, on the 4th at Hunston, on the 5th at Lichfield, on the 8th at Gloucester, on the 10th at Bristol, on the 13th at Bath, on the 16th at Marlborough, on the 18th at Ludgershall, on the 20th at Winchester, on the 22nd at Southampton, on the 24th at Porchester, on the 27th at Aldingbourn, on the 28th at Arundel, on the 29th at Knepe Castle, and on the 31st at Lewes. The King must of course have made all these journeys on horseback over a country scarcely provided with any roads except the Roman roads. But again I will take June in 1212, when the King goes to a more distant and more impracticable tract of country. On June 4th he leaves the Tower of London, and on the 28th is at Durham, having been in the meantime to Hertford, Doncaster, Richmond in

Yorkshire, Bowes, Appleby, Wigton in Cumberland, Carlisle, and Hexham. What is still more remarkable, he marches at much the same rate in Ireland, which was then as little known and as impassable a country as now are the wildest parts of the Sierra Nevada. He reaches Waterford with his troops from Haverfordwest on June 20th, 1210, and is back again at the end of August, having been at every place of importance in the south-eastern half of the country. You must understand that I am not selecting periods in which the King's movements were exceptional or his activity greater than usual. This was practically his life during every month of every year of his reign. King John passes for an effeminate sovereign, but no commercial traveller of our day, employed by a pushing house of business, was ever, I believe, so incessantly in movement, and for so many successive years, with all the help of railways.

We are able to see how the itinerant King gradually became a monarch of the modern type. The change may be attributed to the growth of the system of *missi*, of itinerant deputies of the sovereign, his servants, as the English phrase was, *in eyre*. The first employment of the *missi* was much older than the reign of King John on the Continent, and considerably older in England. But, as is usual in such cases, one system did not all at once displace the other, and Kings, though gradually becoming more stationary or sedentary, did not suddenly cease to move about their dominions when they began to be represented by itinerant justices or deputies of their own. The transition, however, was hastened in our own country by the great constitutional change of which I will speak presently.

But first of all let us notice how this ambulatory life of the ancient Teutonic King gave him an advantage, as a great judicial authority, over the ancient local Popular Courts which had possibly existed from time immemorial by his side. As I have explained, they contained in themselves certain seeds of decay. Their numerous members had the strongest reasons for evading or slackly discharging what must have seemed to them a most rigorous duty. They had to waste many days and to incur many dangers while travelling by forest and fen to the place of meeting. They had to acquaint themselves with all the circumstances of the cases brought before them without any of the aids of a modern Court of Justice. They had often to visit the scene of alleged acts of violence. They had not merely, like a modern jury, to decide on questions of fact; they had also to declare the law or usage and to pronounce the sentence. And then, after all this, they might themselves be proceeded against for a wrongful judgment, and even, according to the judicial system of some communities, they might be called upon to defend their sentence in arms. A capitulary of Charles the Bald bids them go to Court armed as for war, for they might have to fight for their juris-

diction; and at a later date the oath of service exacted by the feudal lord constantly bound the vassal just as closely to service in Court as to service in arms. The burden on the poor man was so severe that the Church interfered in his favour, and a Council of the ninth century protested against the cruelty of forcing the poor to do suit in Court.

But while all these causes were weakening and emptying the Popular Courts, the King was constantly perambulating the country, carrying with him that royal justice which had never been dissociated from him since his dignity existed.¹ The justice which he dispensed was in the first place complete, since he always by his officers executed his own decrees. It was also irresistible, since he generally had with him the flower of the military strength of the country. It was probably purer than that of the popular tribunal, which was certainly not inaccessible to corruption, and it was more exact, for anything like precise legal knowledge was very much confined to the experts who followed the King in his progresses. Moreover, in those days, whatever answered to what we now call the spirit of reform was confined to the King and his advisers; he alone introduced comparative gentleness into the law and simplified its procedure. Thus the royal justice was ever waxing while the popular justice was waning; and from the ascendancy which the first finally attained are in fact descended most of the characteristics which we associate with the law, and which some theorists declare to be inseparable from it—uniformity, inflexibility, and irresistibility.

It may almost be laid down that in England nothing wholly perishes. The itinerant King is still represented among us by the Judges of Assize on Circuit; the ancient Popular Court survives in the Jury, though in the last instance the line of descent is far dimmer and far more broken than in the first. When John reigned, the delegation of the royal authority to itinerant servants of the King

(1) A passage in an interesting book, *Drew's Kashmir and Jummoo*,¹ curiously illustrates the character of the ancient royal jurisdiction, and also one of the motives which produced the King's activity in exercising it. Here is an account of what still goes on in the *Curia Regis* of the Maharajah of Cashmere, himself a sovereign much more modern than the system he follows. Gholab Singh, the first of the dynasty which was established by the English in 1846, was (says Mr. Drew) "always accessible, patient and ready to listen to complaints. He was much given to looking into details; so that the smallest thing might be brought before him and receive his consideration. With the customary offering of a rupee, any one could get his ear; even in a crowd one could catch his eye by holding up a rupee and calling out 'My Lord the King, a petition.' He would pounce down like a hawk on the money, and, having appropriated it, would patiently hear out the petitioner. Once a man after this fashion making his complaint, when the Maharajah was taking the rupee, closed his hand on it and said, 'No; first hear what I have got to say.' Even, this did not go beyond Gholab Singh's patience; he waited till the man had told his tale and opened his hand; then, taking the money, he gave orders about the case." "The civil and criminal cases," it is afterwards stated, "have usually been previously inquired into by judicial officers in the Courts of First Instance, and perhaps have been adjudicated upon by the Court of Appeal; but it is open to suitors and complainants to try their fortune with the Maharajah himself."

for some purposes had long been known; but one branch of royal jurisdiction, that over the Common Pleas, or in other words over the greatest part of the more important civil litigation of the nation, was carried about with him by the King in those surprising progresses of which I have spoken. Hence gradually arose a great abuse. In primitive times, when questions were simple, the King as he approached each local centre in turn had perhaps no difficulty in deciding every case which came before him before he went away. But, as a more complex and wealthier society arose, there was the greatest difficulty in getting the King, as it was called, to give the suitor a day. Sir Francis Palgrave has printed in the second volume of his *Rise of the English Commonwealth* a most curious document, which is the account given by one Richard de Anesty of the trouble and charges to which he was put in respect of a mixed civil and ecclesiastical case which he had before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King. Besides infinite vexation from the ecclesiastical Courts, he had to follow Henry II. across the sea to France and up down England before he could get his day. After reading this paper, we gain a vivid idea of the importance of the provision in the Great Charter that the "Common Pleas shall no longer follow the King." This is a great judicial epoch, marking a revolution in judicature; and King John at once proceeded to illustrate the necessity for it. He sealed Magna Charta at Runnymede on June 15th, 1215, and before July 15th he had been over the whole of the south of England and again northwards as far as Oxford. Meantime the judges of the Common Pleas were sitting—as they did ever since till the Court of Common Pleas was absorbed the other day in the High Court of Justice—at Westminster, and at Westminster only.

With the sealing of the Great Charter the early history of the relation of the English King to civil justice comes to a close, and the modern English judicial system is established. It is distinguished in some respects from the corresponding systems of the European Continent, though these too were results of the same general causes. It is the most highly centralised system of judicial administration in the world, all the important branches of judicial business being localised in London, and a portion only diffused through the country by judges in eyre, the old *missi* sent from the side of the King. The only considerable modification of these principles was made when the modern County Courts were established, courts extremely unlike the old Shire Courts. These last have left the merest trace behind them, perhaps in some mound now overgrown with trees which marks their ancient place of open-air meeting, perhaps in some trifling fine imposed on landholders for failing to attend a non-existent tribunal. Even with the addition of the newer County Courts, the English judicial system has another feature peculiar to itself—the fewness of the judges employed in administering justice.

If you look across the channel to France, you find these characteristics reversed—comparatively little judicial centralisation, a large number of local courts, a multitude of judges distributed over the various tribunals. The French King, like the English King, became the theoretical fountain of justice, but the effect was produced much more by the zeal with which expert lawyers trained in the Roman law preached his authority than by direct supersession of the local courts by emissaries of his own. On the other hand, the character of the law itself, however administered, was much more changed in France and on the Continent generally than in England. The Roman law gained everywhere a considerable, and here and there a complete, ascendancy over ancient custom, and the French Civil Code, the outcome of the Revolution, is only a version of Roman jurisprudence. But, though much is obscure in the beginnings of what we Englishmen call the Common Law, it was undoubtedly in the main a version of Germanic usage, generalised by the King's courts and justices. Some savour of the ancient opposition between the popular justice and the royal justice still clung about it, since you know that, theoretically administered in the King's name, it came at a much later date to be thought the barrier of popular liberty against assertions of prerogative by Tudor and Stuart. Meantime that residuary authority over law and justice, which, as I said at the beginning of this lecture, was never in ancient times quite dissociated from the King, survived the maturity of the common law. From this sprang the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery, which cannot be said to have ever been exactly popular, but which certainly owed whatever unpopularity attached to it not to any supposed inherent badness, but to incidental vices, its dilatoriness and its costliness. But then from this same residuary authority arose the criminal jurisdiction of the Star Chamber, which has become with ordinary English historians a very proverb of judicial oppression. The true historical difference, however, between the so-called equity of the Court of Chancery, and the illegalities or unconstitutionality of the Star Chamber, is that one had its origin before the authority whence it sprang had been seriously questioned, while the other did not obtain an effectual jurisdiction till its time had gone by. The depth of discredit into which Star Chamber justice fell marks the decline and fall of the King's beneficial influence over law. After what I have said this evening, you may perhaps believe that the royal judicial authority was once the most valuable and indeed the most indispensable of all reforming agencies, but at length its course was run, and in nearly all civilised societies its inheritance has devolved upon elective legislatures, themselves everywhere in the western world the children of the British Parliament.

H. S. MAINE.

THE DELIVERER.

I was a captive. Massive walls sevenfold
 Encompassed all the prison, high and bare ;
The stone, the brass, the iron, the triple gold,
 And yet another which we knew not there.

Year after year I wasted there alone ;—
 Now quiet, crushed beneath that woe immense ;
Now moaning with a weary changeless moan ;
 Now frantic with still-baffled impotence :

And heard at times through all that stony gloom
 The idiotic laugh, the piercing cry
Of others ; each within his living tomb
 Chained wretched, helpless, impotent as I.

Until one eve, when I felt sick to death,
 I found a love-prayer cowering in my heart ;
And clothed it with strong wings of passionate breath,
 And sent it thro' the Heavens to plead our part.

“O dreadful Lord, O gracious God, I know
 That I and all the other captives here
Have wrought, each for himself, this doom of woe :
 Yet Thou, All-merciful, bend down thine ear !

“Alas, alas ! what have we for a plea ?
 We are most wretched ; wretched most in this,
That, tho' we strive, we cannot turn to Thee
 In love as Thou to us and all that is.”

In that same night, when I was fallen asleep
 After such agony of yearning prayer,
A voice came gliding through my slumber deep,
 A voice, a glow, a waft of vital air.

I woke ; and, raising gloom-attempered eyes,
 They blinked at lustre, but no form could see.
The Voice rang singing sweet, “Awake, arise !
 And come out hither, and be ever free !”

I stood—the fetters kept no longer hold ;
 I walked straight forward through the dungeon-wall,
 And through the others—brass and iron and gold ;
 And passing thro' them felt them not at all.

And all the while that Voice sang full and sweet,
 “ Come forth, come forth, poor captives every one !
 Oh, shut not fast your ears when I entreat !
 Come forth, and breathe the air and see the sun ! ”

I thought myself quite free, when, lo ! I found
 An adamantine barrier foil me there :
 I could not see, could scarcely feel its bound,—
 A wall, a curtain woven of pure air.

What poignant anguish pierced my blissful trance,
 Thus baffled at the very verge of Heaven !—
 “ Dear Angel of divine deliverance,
 Assist me here, for I in vain have striven ! ”

Louder and sweeter rang the glorious Voice,
 “ Has one, then, wakened up to feel my breath ?
 All holy spirits in your choirs rejoice ;
 Another soul is saved from bonds and death ! ”

The Spirit was beside me dazzling-bright ;
 It burned the way before me through that wall ;
 And I was free beneath the heaven of night,
 Nor felt the barrier I passed thro' at all :

But looking back could see a wall-veil then,
 As smooth as glass, opaquely black as jet,
 Towering on high beyond my farthest ken ;
 But know not by what name to call it yet.

As one who almost swooning drinks of wine,
 I drank in deep the universal air
 And glorious freedom of the world divine ;
 Then fell down worshipping the Splendour there.

It raised me gently as a wounded dove,—
 “ Revere, but worship not, a fellow soul :
 Adore the infinite Wisdom, Truth, and Love,
 The life and breath and being of the Whole.”

It was compact of such intense pure flame,
 That still mine eyes were shut to It, in sooth ;
 The ardour from It thrilled through all my frame
 Like new and purer blood, new life, new youth.

It kissed my brow with such a ravishment
 Of burning bliss that half I swooned away,
 And felt my spirit soaring forth unpent
 From its dissolving funeral urn of clay.

"Henceforward re-assume thy primal dower !
 I bless thee unto perfect liberty
 Of holiest faith and love : 'tis in thy power
 As thou art now, in heart to ever be.

"On earth's most miry ways shall slip thy feet,
 This brow itself may catch the evil stain ;
 But faith and love can burn thee pure and sweet :
 —Farewell, until we may unite again !"

How did these gracious words beneficent
 Fill me with dread and agony !—I cried,
 "Great Spirit, if it be Thy blest intent
 To save me truly, leave not yet my side !

"Stay with me yet awhile, Deliverer, Thou !—
 I am too weak with chains, too blind with gloom,
 For unassisted life ; left lonely now,
 I must relapse into that hideous tomb.

"Or at the least, disrobe awhile Thy form
 Of its too much effulgence, that my sight
 May meet Thy face ; and so thro' every storm
 Preserve one Guiding-star, one Beacon-light."

"Because I burn in my pure nakedness,
 Thou canst not meet me with thy mortal gaze . .
 Thy prayer is granted : a material dress,
 A form of shadowing gloom my soul arrays."

Oh bliss ! I saw Her thro' the sevenfold veil ;—
 A mighty Seraph shining ruby-clear,
 Clothed in majestic wings of golden mail ;
 A sun within the midnight atmosphere.

But still her countenance I scarce could scan,
 For living glories of the golden hair,
 And rapture of the eyes cerulean
 As solemn summer heavens burning bare.

Around her head a crystal circlet shone,
 Fore-crested with a pure white flying dove :
 In emeralds and in sapphires writ thereon,
 Athwart the brow, one word was flaming,—Love.

And when she spoke her voice was now so sweet
 In soft low music, tremulous with sighs,
 That one might dreaming hear his Mother greet
 With such a voice his soul to Paradise.

“ He is so weak, so weak who should be strong,
 Weak as a babe, faint-hearted, almost blind ;
 The curse of previous bondage clingeth long :
 He must not lapse into that den behind.

“ The sun indeed shines ever in the sky :
 But when the realm is turned from him to night,
 When moon and stars gleam faint and cold on high
 Or else are veiled by stormy clouds from sight ;

“ The traveller then through field and sombre wood
 Finds his own poor dim lamp best guide his feet ;
 The man at home his household taper good
 For useful light, his household fire for heat.

“ Celestial flowers are set in earthly clay :
 However small the circle of a life,
 If it be whole it shall expand for aye ;
 And all the Heavens are furled in Man and Wife.

“ So thou, the man, the circle incomplete,
 Shalt find thy other segment and be whole ;
 Thy manhood with her womanhood shall meet
 And form one perfect self-involving soul.

“ Thy love shall grow by feeling day by day
 Celestial love, thro’ human, blessing thee ;
 Thy faith wax firm by witnessing alway
 Triumphant faith for ever glad and free.

“By her obedience thy soul shall learn
 How far humility transcendeth pride ;
 By her pure intuitions shall discern
 The fatal flaws of reason unallied.

“Thou shalt see strength in weakness conquering,
 The bravest action with the tenderest heart,
 Self-sacrifice unconscious hallowing
 The lightest playing of the meanest part.

“Chastity, purity, and holiness
 Shall shame thy virile grossness ; and the power
 Of beauty in the spirit and its dress
 Reveal all virtue lovely as a flower.

“Till love for her shall teach thee love for all ;
 Till perfect reverence for her shall grow
 To faith in God which nothing can appal,
 Tho’ His green world be dark with sin and woe.

“Children, by all they are to glad and grieve,
 Shall teach thee what a loving Father is,
 And how to give is better than receive :—
 I bless thee with all household charities.

“A priceless boon ! and, like such boons to men,
 A glorious blessing or a fatal curse :
 Thou canst not sink back into yon vile den ;
 Sinking at all, thou sinkest to a worse.”

When thus her words were ended, it might seem
 That I was lapsing from a heavenly trance
 Into some scarce less blissful earthly dream,
 So wonderfully did a change advance.

Her supernatural beauty grew less bright,
 Tho’ scarce less beautiful ; the fiery name
 Died out like fire ; the wings of flashing light
 Were slowly back-withdrawn into her frame.

The Spirit of the empyréan Heaven
 Was incarnated into human birth,
 The purest Seraph of the loftiest Seven
 Become a maiden of this lower earth.

Yet still she was the same, thus different :
The pinions there, tho' not put forth in power ;
The glory there, tho' in the body pent ;—
Both sheathed thus safely till the fitting hour :

And in her mien, and on her face and brow,
And in her violet eyes, as clear the sign
Of Love supreme and infinite shone now
As when it blazed in jewel-fires divine.

* * * * *

I woke. A tender hand all silently
Had drawn the curtain and dispersed the gloom ;
The whole triumphant morning in a sea
Of warmth and splendour dazzled thro' the room.

The dearest face, the best-belovèd eyes,
Were shining down upon me where I lay ;—
A-glow with love and rapturous surprise,
Seeing my fever was all passed away.

JAMES THOMSON.

November, 1859.

THE SALMON FISHERIES.

THE present state of the salmon fisheries excites an unusual amount of discontent in at least one class of those interested in them. That discontent seems to be well founded, and is certainly not new. Yet Parliament has ever lent a ready ear to the fisherman's complaint. The early statute books are full of Salmon Acts. In later days Mr. Henley, a member of the old school, short of speech and jealous of the time of the House, said regretfully that there never was a session without its Fishery Bill, and in the last dozen years Acts relating to the fisheries of England alone have been passed in 1870, 1873, 1876, 1877, 1879, and Bills on the same subject were brought to the House of Commons in 1880 and 1881. Whence comes this perpetual need for legislative aid? It accords no doubt with the genius of the English people that all legislation should be tentative. Our very Constitution has been piled up precedent by precedent, each one created with extreme caution as occasion demanded, and held to with tenacity when created. But no other subject than the fisheries has occupied Parliament from its most ancient days, still occupies it, and seems likely to occupy it as long as Parliament shall exist. And yet the nature of salmon does not change, the rivers still run between the same banks, and fishermen are as greedy, no more and no less than were their fathers before them.

Such an expenditure of legislation seems to show that though these fisheries need protection, and have always been considered well worthy of it, their requirements have not been understood. If the public had known what they wanted, Parliament would have readily granted it. Unfortunately, however, the subject has been generally regarded as one, interesting indeed, but scarcely within the province of the uninitiated to discuss. The public, neglectful or ignorant of their own large interests therein, have been misled into thinking it a question of rods *v.* nets, or sport *v.* business. By many the fisheries have been remitted to the care of natural history or fishery specialists; by others treated as a prize to be fought over by the owners of rivers or their banks. The men best acquainted with them have been those whose interests were most affected. The wider public claims have been lost sight of, and the narrow local policy, too often allowed to prevail, has required in a short time recurrence to better principles with fresh legislation to enforce them.

A clear idea, then, of the salmon fisheries and the interests connected with them may help greatly to a conclusion respecting their present requirements, and to try to obtain this I will first endeavour

to describe what a river is quâ salmon, and to show what the interests involved in these fisheries are.

The upper part of a river is the nursery. In the shallows of the upper waters and in the streams flowing into the river the fish are mostly bred. The lower part of the fresh waters, where some are also bred, chiefly serves as a highway up and down which they pass as their nature requires to the salt water below, to feed and fatten, and back to the nursery to breed. The interests in the rivers may be divided into two, public and private, and each of these may again be subdivided—the private interest into that of the upper and lower proprietors, according to the position they occupy on the river bank; the public into the interest of the fishermen on their common law right in the tidal waters, and that of the consumer. Of these four interests three are inter-opposed. Upon the fresh-water owner, especially the upper, falls the care, and to a great extent the cost, of protection during the spawning season when the fish are most easily killed; and to the lower or tidal men the principal harvest of the fish that the upper men have bred. The interest of the consumer is in accord with that of each of the three classes, but their interests directly conflict with one another; each desires to take the greater share of the produce, and as that produce is limited, the fish that each takes is a fish lost to the others.

Their claims, then, are difficult to reconcile, and yet unless they are satisfied the fisheries cannot be prosperous. For the well-being of the river depends on the good-will and co-operation of all those who have a right of fishing it. More especially is necessary the good-will of the upper men. That no force of watchers or bailiffs could stop winter poaching in the small streams of the hills or moors, unless they were aided by the local keepers and the local good-will, has been proved again and again in Scotland and Ireland, and still more lately in the case of the Wye. And these small streams are the most valuable portions of the rivers for breeding purposes.

There is but one way of solving the question, and that is, in legislating upon it, to disregard the conflicting claimants altogether, and to keep exclusively in view the welfare of the public interest as a consumer. Any endeavour to make a compromise between the three classes of fishermen, upper and lower, must fail unless this rule be observed. I contend that all good fishery legislation has been based upon it; that by right, by law and by necessity the consumer's interest must be treated as paramount; that unless it be so regarded and so treated, the fisheries cannot exist; and that, if so treated, the private proprietors and public fishermen, as well as the public generally, will greatly profit, whilst to each class will be given all that they have a fair claim to demand.

The right, however, of Parliament to deal with the fisheries on

this principle seems to be nowadays not understood by the public, and is contested by some private proprietors. It is not uncommon to hear a long and valuable river spoken of as the property of the owner of a fishery at the mouth of it; attempts to abolish or to regulate injurious modes of fishery are met with cries of confiscation; it has even been lately stated in print, by a proprietor on the Wye, that "the public have nothing to do with the salmon fisheries, inasmuch as they are all private property;" and colour has also been given to these claims, by holding an official inquiry into the state of a river at the expense of the private proprietors. It therefore becomes necessary to insist on the public interest in the fisheries, and to refer for this purpose to the origin and exercise of that interest.

In old days, when the right of a man to do what he liked with his own was scarcely questioned, salmon were the King's fish. The King dealt freely with his own. Grants were made by the Crown to its servants or favourites, and "Several Fisheries" were thus created at the mouths and in the fairway of many rivers. These fisheries, worked by means of fish weirs, dams, stells, or garths, without stint or restriction, soon made salmon unpleasantly scarce. Over-fishing fished the rivers out; the loss of food, especially of fish food in those days of fasting, was serious. Great complaints arose, and by Magna Charta it was determined that no more such grants should be made. The Crown became a trustee for the public in the matter of the salmon fisheries. The right of Parliament to restrain the amount and kind of fishing was exercised. The public right to the fisheries in the tidal waters outside the limits of the then existing several fisheries was asserted, and has from that time to this been unquestioned both in England and in Ireland, although in practice, especially in Ireland, it has been often grievously encroached upon. In Scotland the salmon are still the King's fish, and the right of any man to fish for salmon, even from his own land in inland waters, is successfully contested by the Commissioners who administer the Crown property, unless he can show a grant, or such user as is by law held to be prescriptive evidence of such a grant.

An instance of the exercise of this right on behalf of the Crown, showing the paramount nature of the old Crown right, has lately come within my experience, and is interesting because, as the Crown rights in the salmon fisheries were identical in the three kingdoms, this exercise of the Crown right in Scotland illustrates the nature of the public right derived from the Crown in England and Ireland. I was consulted in 1879—80 as to the construction of a pass over a fall impassable to fish. The plan was made, but the Commissioners of Woods and Forests refused to grant the right to fish for salmon in the rivers and lakes which the construction of the pass would have been the means of stocking with salmon, unless a considerable sum

were paid for the right of fishing. No user could be established or even claimed, for as no salmon had ever passed the fall no grant of salmon fishery could be presumed. Difficulties arose as to how payment of the sum exacted on behalf of the Crown should be apportioned among the proprietors of the land above the fall, and the pass has not been made.

The origin of the right of Parliament to deal with the salmon fisheries in the manner that appears to it best for the consumer, dates from *Magna Charta*; and of the exercise of this right abundant examples may be found in the Committees and Commissions which have sat and reported, and in the Acts of Parliament which have been passed. These Acts have from the earliest times imposed prohibitions on certain modes of fishing, restrictions upon others, fixing close seasons, and in all ways dealing with the fisheries as seemed to Parliament most conducive to the public good.

A salmon river is in very truth a farm—a Highland farm, where the sheep descend to the low grounds to feed and carry back to the hills the flesh they have put on. It is the interest of the public, consumer or fisherman, and of the proprietor, upper or lower, that this farm should produce the largest possible amount of fish. To attain this result a balance must be struck—for the farm by the farmer, for the river by Parliament—between the production and capture. In either the hill or river farm, the breeding stock must be kept at the full, the surplus stock only brought into market.

Production is limited by nature in each river by the amount of spawning-ground and the number of breeding fish it possesses. Capture unlimited by nature must be limited by law, for there is no river in the kingdom, owned by more than one proprietor, that could and would not be cleared out in a single season if the law did not restrict the amount of fishing. Unless restrained, the owner of the Several Fishery nearest the sea, or the proprietor in that position of both banks, or the two riparian proprietors so placed who, facing one another, could agree together, would build a weir across the river, close the highway, and catch every fish. Free circulation is as necessary to the life of a salmon river as it is to a man, and the weir would act as a halter. For a year or two good profits would be made, and the supply of food even be increased; at the end of that time the fisheries of that river would be extinct. If no weir were erected a similar result, though less rapid and complete, would be brought about with the net.

Salmon legislation, then, has been and must be founded on the paramount character of the public interest in salmon as a valuable article of food. The highest good for the greatest number might be its motto. The object, the production of the greatest number of fish; and the means, the limitation of capture.

Limitation must be sufficient. The forms of restriction chosen should be those which are most easily enforced and most general in incidence. Fair play, too, should be dealt out to the private proprietors as far as is consistent with the public interest and their own.

But is the present limitation sufficient, as those who profit by the present state of things allege? One proof that it is not, is found in the continuous request for fresh legislation, and further evidence is not wanting.

The Royal Commission in 1860 found the English salmon fisheries in as low a state as was compatible with bare existence. The Act of 1861, founded on the principles I have been advocating, was passed, and the salmon fisheries improved up to a certain point, but are no longer improving. The report made by Mr. Walpole this year states that the produce of the English salmon fisheries was estimated in 1863 at £18,000, in 1865 at £30,000, and for some years past at £100,000. Now in 1865 the improvement to be expected from the Act of 1861 had not, or had scarcely, commenced, for it takes three, or more probably four, years to make a salmon. The sum of £100,000 is "for some years past," and is therefore the final outcome of the late salmon fishery legislation and preservation. Such an improvement is satisfactory if accepted as a proof that the principles of the Act of 1861 are sound, and with extension would produce farther improvement, but as a final result it is poor enough. Ireland sends to England five times as much besides its home consumption. Scotland sends on an average year double that amount to London alone. Nor can we reckon on retaining even this increase of produce.

Mr. Walpole's reports show that England and Wales sent to Billingsgate Market in 1865, when the benefit of the legislation of 1861 had not yet been fully felt, only 868 boxes. In the next seven years, 1866 to 1872, no less than 14,989 boxes were sent, and in the next seven years, 1873 to 1879, only 10,595. Mr. Walpole points out that English salmon are in great measure consumed in the neighbourhood where they are caught. But the amount sent to London may be fairly taken as the surplus left by the neighbourhoods' consumption, and as it is probable that in abundant years more would be consumed at home than in scarce ones, the falling off is probably greater than the figures show. In the absence of better statistical information, recourse must be had to that which we have; and it is so extremely difficult to obtain any accurate statistics respecting fisheries, that Mr. Walpole must be congratulated on the considerable amount contained in his reports. Such local reports as he publishes, and his own comments as well as general outside opinion, would lead us to suppose that there is no continuous increase, but rather the reverse. What is the cause? The rods accuse the nets, the

nets the rods. Both nets and rods talk of the restrictions imposed on themselves, of pollution, of increased population and traffic. The net fishermen of the Tay say that the annual close time, and those of the Eden that the weekly close time, is too long. The more they kill, the more will there be left to kill, that is their opinion, and is the opinion loudly expressed of too many fishermen on too many rivers. But it is at least as fair an argument that if the increased protection afforded by the Act of 1861 and its successors increased the fisheries from £30,000 to £100,000, still more protection would increase the £100,000 in the same proportion.

General assertion and contradictory opinions can scarcely be accepted without examination on a point so important as the cause of the decrease. And here we are met with one of the great difficulties that attend this subject. It is so very hard to obtain, not only statistical, but any other sort of definite evidence. The men to whom the persons charged with any inquiry have to apply are those who will be affected by the conclusion arrived at. Their minds are biassed by their interests. From the limited local character of their experience, they are often ignorant and full of prejudice. The net-men will rarely, if ever, give in evidence figures to show the amount of their takes, fearing that such information may be used against them, either by their landlords as a proof that their rent is too low, or by their neighbours, as a proof that they are getting more than their share of the fish. On the other hand, the rod-take is often exaggerated, for the glory of the achievement of landing a salmon is apt to make fish grow unnaturally in size and number after they are out of the water. River-bank rumours are proverbial, and the takes of ancient as well as modern days must be received with caution. The investigations recently held on the state of the Wye not only show both the difficulty of obtaining evidence and the reticence of those who could supply it, but throw some light on the causes of decrease. One inquiry was held by Lord Aberdare at the request of the Secretary of State in 1877, and others by the inspectors. The upper men proved on all occasions that the fish had become scarce in their waters. They attributed this scarcity to the increased fishing of the nets below them; but they had no means of proving this, except the record of the takes made by those nets. The net-men did not directly refute the accusation of the rod-men by a reference to their books. Instead of doing so, to use Messrs. Walpole and Huxley's words "the proprietors of the middle-water (net) fisheries were particularly reticent on the subject of their takes," and they made their defence by casting blame on every thing and body but themselves. After hearing their evidence, Lord Aberdare came to the conclusion that the causes of decrease were "numerous and multiform, and in most respects traceable to the

altered conditions of the times we live in." The opinion of Lord Aberdare on fishing subjects deserves especial weight with all persons interested in them. It would be difficult to value too highly the able and continuous assistance that Mr. H. A. Bruce, when Under-Secretary of State, gave to those engaged in salmon-fishing reform, not only in England, but in the sister kingdoms; and if it had been possible for Lord Aberdare to extend his inquiry to other rivers, I have no doubt that he would have modified the opinion above quoted.

It is easy for those interested in the continuance of things that be, to make a general reference to changes which all know exist, and to find in them reasons to account for the mischief all observe. But it is dangerous to apply these general references to particular cases. The condition of the times we live in is probably less altered in the Wye than in many rivers. The Severn and the Tyne were described this year in the *Times* as great sufferers from the same general causes. The Severn suffers from obstruction by weirs preventing free access to the spawning grounds, rather than pollution. The Tyne will shortly be referred to, to prove how a comparatively high rate of produce may be obtained in spite of pollution by mines and population, of traffic and steam vastly greater than is met with in the quiet Wye valley. Newport must contribute tons more dirt, and vastly more traffic and disturbance, to the smaller neighbouring Usk than Chepstow and Monmouth to the Wye. The population, railways, mines, and factories on Usk bank are all greater, area for area, than are found on the Wye. Yet the Usk is peaceful, well-managed, and prosperous; the Wye a battle-field in a battle-field's barren condition.

But is there not reason enough for non-improvement without seeking for it in circumstances that we find co-existent with good progress and fair production elsewhere? For produce there must be producers, and it is notorious that the rivers are now so hardly fished that hundreds of miles of spawning ground in the English and Welsh rivers have not had for many winters a pair of fish upon them. The breeding fish, too, must be protected, and they can only be protected by the upper men in whose waters they breed. Therefore these men must be treated in such a way as to obtain their goodwill and assistance. How are they treated? In the Appendix to Mr. Walpole's Reports are given the answers of the different boards to certain questions. One of these questions is as to the relative take by nets and by rods in each district. Categorical answers to this inquiry were obtained for the year 1880 from the following rivers only, and the return is eloquent:—

District.	Number of Salmon taken by nets and fixed engines.	By rod.
Ribble	3,932	39
Clwyd and Elwy	852	120
Teign	120	10
Severn	16,000	15
Avon, Brue, and Parrett .	200	0
		(no licence for rods taken out.)
Avon and Stour ¹	738	28
Yorkshire	2,207	20
Esk	2,032	57
Tyne	26,482	948
Total	52,563	1,237

In these nine districts, then, the men that bred the fish took last year 1,237 out of a total of 52,563.

But limitation, I repeat, to be effective must be sufficient, and must accord with fair play. How are these requirements met generally, as shown by the above returns? How are they met on the Severn? The nets and fixed engines take 16,000 fish, the rods 15. It is evident that under the present law, the fish escape upwards during the fishing season in such small numbers as to make it scarcely worth while to use a rod at all. Not nearly all of these 16,000 fish are bred in the Severn; but it is a marvel that under such circumstances the Severn should yield so many fish as it does. That marvel is due to the excellence of the natural quality of the river, and of the organization of the Severn fishery district, into which the long established and admirably conducted Severn fishery association at Worcester, with a branch at Shrewsbury, has merged.

But take the case of the Tyne. Here the nets get 26,482 out of the total net catch of 52,563 and the rods 948 out of the total rod catch of 1,237. In other words, the river where the rod fisheries are moderately productive is, length for length, enormously more productive than the other eight rivers where the rods get very little. And the Tyne case is the stronger because it is one where liberal treatment of the upper proprietors has overcome great natural difficulties. The Tyne's condition in 1861 was very bad. At the mouth was Newcastle with its pollution and traffic. In the upper waters, the South Tyne, a full half of the river, was completely poisoned by the mines. At Bywell, a short distance above the tideway, a fishing mill dam closed the river's course. The upper proprietors, however, desired strongly to bring the Act into operation, and Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, the proprietor of the Bywell dam, with much liberality removed it. There are no nets above, and the river became a rod river. Notwithstanding the pollution by mines, the traffic and pollution of Newcastle, the drainage, the sheep-washing and other

(1) Plus three hundred supposed to have been taken in the Royalty.

altered conditions of the times we live in, the Tyne in 1878 yielded 48,150 salmon.

Let us turn to the Usk and the Wye. These two rivers are similar in character, and flow into the Bristol Channel. The Usk, much smaller than the Wye, has so little netting in the fresh water that it may be almost called a rod river. But it must not be supposed on that account to yield no fish to the nets. The fact is that very many of the fish taken in the Severn district are brod in the Usk. Salmon only enter the fresh portion of a river with high or flood water. The Severn district comprises a portion of the Bristol Channel; that channel forms an estuary common to the Severn, Wye, and Usk. The fish waiting for a flood pass in a dry season up and down this estuary for days or weeks, and thus the Usk fish fall into the Severn district nets. The season for 1879 was a wet one. Many fish escaped the nets, for they took their river at once. The Usk rods caught 3,550 salmon; the Severn net-takes fell to 9,855. The fishing season of 1880 was dry. The Usk rods took, principally after the net close season had commenced, 1,267 fish; the take of the Severn nets rose to 16,000.

It is in this among other ways that rivers are inter-dependent, and in this way among others that the public derive so great a benefit from the efforts of the private proprietors to preserve for sport.

Contrast the case of the Wye with that of the Usk. The Wye is one of the most valuable rivers, estimated by its producing capabilities, in all England. The greatest desire is shown by the private owners to preserve it. But their own view of their own interests prevents all combination, and the river almost remains a waste. The Wye, unfortunately for itself, offers excessive facilities for netting, and these facilities are remorselessly taken advantage of. Lord Aberdare states in the Report already referred to, that "netting is practised over seventy-one miles of its course, viz. fifty-seven middle, and fourteen tidal waters." The fact needs no comment. The result can only be one—decrease in yield, and decrease be it remembered from a very poor commencement, and such discontent in the breeding districts that the fish are not preserved and the law is openly defied.

Mr. Walpole and Professor Huxley, in their report to Parliament on the riots that occurred last winter, state that "It is obvious from the evidence we have received at Rhayader, that the upper proprietors can enforce order if they choose to do so;" and again, "The striking fact with which we are confronted in Radnorshire is, that the persons who ought to have been on the side of order were more or less in sympathy with disturbance of order." Can it be wondered at? Before the Act of 1861 salmon-spearing and fishing for salmon fry gave, in the scarcity of better sport, some amusement to the men living on the upper waters of the Wye. The Act declares spears and fry fishing illegal. The clauses containing these provisions excited at first

much hostility among the Wye men to the Bill. This opposition was in no small part allayed by the promise held out to them of a fairer share in the produce they bred. These promises were made in good faith by the promoters of the Bill and of fishery reform, in the belief that the principles of the Act of 1861 would be extended rather than departed from, and a more even distribution of the fish insured. This has not been done. The Act has fulfilled the expectations formed of it, but its essential policy of restraint on over-fishing has not been pursued. After numerous inquiries the upper proprietors of the Wye remain as badly or perhaps worse supplied with fish than they were before 1861, and have also lost their poor compensation of spear and fry fishing.

The case of the Wye is hopeless, as the case of all rivers must be hopeless so long as the upper proprietors are unjustly treated. Unless those on the Wye are disposed, in Messrs. Walpole and Huxley's words, to "exert the full force of their legal, social, and moral authority," the poaching so long practised on the Upper Wye can never be put down. Is that exertion to be expected from men who not only have no interest in its result, but are suffering from a just sense of ill-usage? To discuss restoring to them their spear and fry fishing, as some of them have requested, is idle. It could have no effect but to quicken the extermination of the fish. "There are not fish enough to breed, so let us kill what there are,"—that is the plain meaning of those who ask for the permission.

Remembering the difficulty of obtaining definite evidence, strong proof has I think been given to show that the chief cause of the decrease is to be found in the excessive net-fishing—in circumstances, in short, over which Parliament has ready control, a control it has constantly exercised and will have to exercise again if it cares for the existence of salmon in British waters. There is, indeed, only one course that can be taken with success: the limitations are insufficient; make them sufficient. They are so unfair in their incidence that the law cannot be enforced, and its whole object is defeated. Make them fair as far as possible. To carry out these objects, act as if solely influenced by the interest of the consumer, and, receiving all complaints of the private owners with a deaf ear and a heart made light by the certainty that they will be the first to profit, firmly take such measures as will lead to the production of the largest possible amount of fish.

Of all methods of limitation the most effectual is that of "prohibition." This antidote to over-fishing should be applied to net-fishing in inland water. The fresh' water alone is fitted for the rod, and the use of nets in it generally, or to the extent to which they are now used, allows of a greater capture of fish than the necessities of reproduction can justify. The limb destroys the health of the whole body; cut it off. Is not this better than, for the sake of permitting a few men to

retain engines whose use has rendered their use almost useless, to cause whole rivers to remain unproductive? In fresh waters, then, permit the rod, but prohibit the net.

It will be necessary also to restrict the net in tidal waters, for no river could produce fish enough to permit of unrestricted netting, even in those waters only. The best method of restricting the capture by nets is, first, the prohibition of all fixed engines, as all means of taking fish that are not movable are termed. The destructive character of fixed engines has always been, and is now, almost universally acknowledged, though unfortunately not universally enforced. Secondly, by enacting a "close season." Of close seasons there are two kinds, weekly and annual. The extension of either is open to objection. A longer weekly close season leaves the fishermen out of work, at a great loss to the employers, for a considerable portion of the week. They must be paid a week's wages for five days' or perhaps four days' work. A longer annual close season would leave the market unsupplied for a longer period when the fish are still in condition; and as an annual close season, to be effective, must be general, and accompanied by prohibition of sale, much hardship would be inflicted upon the smaller rivers by fixing an earlier date of commencement, and on the larger by fixing a later date of termination, than those—viz. Sept. 1, Feb. 1—named in the Act of 1861. But there is another form as yet never applied to salmon that would not be open to these objections, and in other respects would be highly advantageous, viz. a nightly close season. At the present moment the fisheries are very generally worked night and day by double sets of men. The rule adopted in one fishery must be followed by those above and below, for they are all fishing one against the other. The great outlay in wages thus occasioned must be paid for in fish before any profit is made. The effect of a nightly close season in the tidal fisheries would be a diminished take, but also a diminished expenditure. The diminished take would leave a larger breeding stock. The larger breeding stock would yield a larger production, and the fisheries would give a less gross, but a larger, or as large, nett return. Let us look at this in detail, or perhaps an example will serve more readily the purpose of explanation.

There is a river in the north of Scotland that has two net fisheries at its mouth, and is fished above by both net and rod. The yearly nett yield of each of the two lower fisheries was until recently on an average about £500 a year. Some three or four years ago the lower of these fisheries was let by tender to a Perth man at an increased rental. He fished as Perth men fish, better or at least as well as any net-fishermen in the world. His system was shortly learnt by the men above him. Fishing night and day throughout the season was adopted, and for two years increased profits were made. The third year the fishery failed. Of the lower of the two fisheries I

only know generally that that season and the one succeeding were bad. The upper could earn no rent in either year. In the third it scarcely made its working expenses; and in the fourth, not earning the expenses of the night crew, it was discharged. The fisheries above, rod and net, were of course almost destroyed. The first two years were good and the last bad, because the breeding as well as the surplus stock had been killed. On the four years the nett profits did not equal the nett profits of the four preceding seasons, and now the river is fished out.

It is not true that there are as good fish in the sea as ever came out of it. Under systems sanctioned by this beguiling proverb, salmon before 1861 had nearly become extinct in England; oysters have since risen to 4d. apiece; mussels are scarce, lobsters and crabs are hard to get. The Dublin Bay haddock of a generation ago is rarely to be seen. Herrings have "deserted" an inlet for years, and soles have become one of the dearest instead of the cheapest of fish. Wherever fish from local causes are easily taken, it is simply a matter of capture and production. Dealing with it as a question of food, *i.e.* of gross production, the more the fishing is in excess, the less will that production be. Regarding it as a question of profit, the larger the outlay the less will be the profit, for capture at the rate of 99 per cent. on 100 fish will not yield as much as a take of 50 per cent. on 500.

Apply the restrictions proposed to the typical case just mentioned. Under a nightly close season an increased proportion of fish would escape the lower nets. Against this loss must be set the saving in wages for the night crews. Further, the abolition of netting in the upper waters would preserve to the river for breeding purposes the fish now captured by those nets, and from the increased breeding stock would come increased production. Nor would the loss to the tidal fisheries be as great as it seems. The fish run backwards and forwards in the tideway waiting a flood, and not a small percentage of those whom the nightly close time had spared would be taken on the next days. It is in floods only, when the flood is fining, that the fish run right through, and in floods also the nets cannot "work so clean."

The inland men, such of them as have nets, would lose them, but in most cases their water would become as, or more, valuable for the rod alone than it now is for the rod and net. The water of those who have no nets now would reap a large and unmixed advantage. The increased number of fish reaching their waters would repay them for the cost of that preservation it is so essential to the fisheries that they should ungrudgingly accord.

It is well known that salmon almost invariably return from the sea to their native rivers, often indeed entering the estuaries, but most rarely the fresh waters of other rivers. Out of the numerous experiments made with marked salmon and fry, there are very few, if any, well-authenticated instances of a fish that had been marked in

one river being taken in the fresh waters of another. Again, in an estuary common to two or more rivers, or in the lower part of a river common to two or more tributaries, the local fishermen are able to pick out the fish of one tributary or branch from those of any other. The estuary of Waterford is common to the Suir, Nore, and Barrow. The fish of each of these rivers are distinguishable from the fish of the others. They are all three taken in the estuary, but the fresh waters of each only yield their native-born fish. The Conon is joined by the Orrin a mile or two above the tideway, and by the Blackwater a few miles higher. Below the lower junction the Orrin fish (a fish of very peculiar make and character) are taken; above that junction, even in a fine pool immediately above the junction, no Orrin fish is ever caught; and so in the Blackwater no Conon fish is taken, and the Upper Conon yields only the fish that are bred between its own banks.

This law of return is practically very important, for it affords a strong inducement to preservation. But the inducement is in fact much stronger than is known. I have no doubt before long it will be proved that the law, much more extensive in its application than has yet been acknowledged, guides the return of the fish not only to the river, but to the branch or part of the branch in which they have been bred. Mr. Buckland, in his interesting report of last year, speaking of heavy fish spawning in "a little stream called the Dowlais brook, which joins the Severn a short distance above Bewdley," goes on to say: "The bed of the brook is nearly all rock, and very bad spawning ground; and as there is but little gravel and very scant water in the summer, the young fish would probably be lost. Nevertheless, the salmon seem to like this brook, and over fifty have been counted in half a mile. The water bailiff catches these fish and puts them back into the river. From the 12th to the 20th December, 1872, he caught and put back over forty fish, but these same fish returned in a few hours. A similar case to this occurs in the lower waters of the Teme." The fish knew what they liked better than the bailiff, and returned to the brook to breed because they were bred there. The young of salmon remain one, two, or even sometimes three years in the neighbourhood of their native shallows, and it is to these same shallows that I believe they, when grown up, themselves return to breed. The proprietor, then—and it cannot be too widely known—who protects the spawning fish, or kelts, or fry, protects them for his own individual benefit, and, if over-fishing be not permitted below, may look for a return to his own waters of a fair percentage of the fish he protects and breeds.

The gain to the consumer to be expected from the increased restrictions on netting proposed would of course be very large. It has been shown by the cases of the Tyne and the Usk how the presence of fish in sufficient numbers to make the rod-fishing worth

caring for, confers a beneficial effect on the net-fishing by stimulating preservation. The result of a contrary policy may be met with almost everywhere. The abuse is greater perhaps in the Wye, with its seventy-one miles of netted water, and the first cry of confiscation would probably be loudest from there. But as shown already, Parliament has ever exercised the right, not of confiscating fishery property, but of regulating or prohibiting the use of certain instruments of capture. Parliament took the spears from the upper men of the Wye. It may, on the same ground of public expediency, take the nets from the middle men. Nor would their loss be great. Their take, at present small, is decreasing, and must decrease. With the present poor stock of fish in the river, for them to fish for salmon with the rod would be waste of time. But with increased production, a production relative to that of the Usk—and such a production must result from the adoption of the Usk system of protection—and with perhaps as much work to make the bottoms of their streams and pools rough with stones as has been often given to make the pools smooth to the net service, these middle men will before long take more fish with their rods than they now get with their nets.

The fish run through their water now with little rest, because there is no rest for them. Salmon are shy, and as long as they are hunted they will not lie up. Every wild animal will pass quickly over a debatable track, and make for a haven where he hopes to be quiet. Nor will a salmon remain long in an even-swirling stream that is neither strong enough to tire him or slack enough to let him rest without exertion. He chooses his home among rocks and big stones that will give him shelter and shade. From behind some flood-stained brown mass or grey ledge he loves to see the water flashing by and over him, whilst he lies protected from the turbulent stream and hateful observation. In such a vantage post he is at ease, and takes his rest with his belly fins well spread out, as poor Mr. Buckland wrote, "like a prop placed behind a cart when going uphill." The Wye midwater lacks such havens, but it is easy to make them. Give the fish rest from the net, and place rocks and boulder stones in the streams or pools to give them shelter. Where rocks are wanting, shingle or gravel bound in masses with Portland cement will make a conglomerate that will serve as well. If this were done, and the changes suggested were carried out generally, the 3,550 salmon taken by the rod in a good season on the Usk may readily be doubled on the Wye; the 16,000 captured by the net in the Severn district would meet with a corresponding enhancement; and it is very certain that the £100,000 worth of produce that is now estimated to represent the total annual outcome of the English and Welsh salmon fisheries would show such increase as would be a subject of public congratulation.

This paper has grown to such a length that I will only refer to

two other matters whose importance makes me very unwilling to pass them entirely over.

It has been said that the rivers are interdependent. The management of the district boards does not appear to recognise this sufficiently, though Mr. Walpole's reports have plainly pointed out the injury that may be done to other districts by yielding to the desires of one. The annual close season depends for its efficacy upon its general enforcement and the closing of all markets. As long as sale is legal the market will be supplied. How true this is was shown years ago. The Act of 1861 fixed September 1st as the commencement of the close season, and prohibited the sale of salmon in England after September 3rd. So the poached fish were sent to Paris, and a considerable trade at once sprang up. Representations were made by the Fisheries' Preservation Association and the inspectors, through our Foreign Minister, Earl Russell, to Napoleon III., who closed the Paris market. The Emperor's prohibition was rather suddenly published in November. While making an official visit at the time to the Coquet, it was reported to me that a number of boxes of salmon had been found buried in the river bank. There was no market, and the fish were useless. If this was the result with the market open in Paris, how much more must it be the case with a market open in our own country! Yet changes have been made by by-law postponing the commencement of the general close season in no less than fifteen English districts. For the supposed good of these districts, and they are the least important, a stimulus to poaching is given throughout the kingdom. Nor is the change for the real good of the districts for which the rule of a general close season has been relaxed. The time of year when salmon go out of condition is nearly the same in every river. The case of the Cornish rivers appears most to demand relaxation. At an inquiry held in the autumn of 1860 on the state of these rivers, the fishermen contended that late fishing was necessary and expedient in Cornwall. In support of this contention they produced in court a female salmon, for the purpose of establishing the excellence of the condition of their fish at that time of year. Just taken from the sea, it was fresh and bright as a fish in spring, but the lobes of spawn were so large that the shape of the belly changed as the fish was held up by the head or the tail. By the desire of the Commissioners it was opened on the court table, and the fact that the size of the ova showed it to be almost ready to spawn, put an end for that day to the fishermen's case.

Moreover, the condition of the fish cannot be permitted to determine the date for the commencement of the close season. In one British river or another there are "fresh fish," that is fish that will not spawn till the succeeding winter, to be found in every month of the year. On closing the fishing boxes some years ago on

the Carra in November, a number of such fish were taken. On the Sligo river a similar experiment made in December showed a similar result. None of these fish would have spawned for twelve months. The first, second, and third elements to be considered in determining the length of the annual close season must be the amount of fishing that can be conceded without injury to the breeding stock, and there is no river, probably not even in Cornwall, where in them or the tidal waters adjoining the surplus breed cannot be taken before September. But supposing this would not be the case in the Cornish rivers, where alone fishing by net is permitted till October 1st, is it worth while for a possible slight gain to rivers of such comparatively trivial value to injure all the rivers in the kingdom? It is difficult to estimate that value accurately, for the Cornish districts send no report of amount of fish taken; but their return of license duties for salmon gives a sufficient gauge of their importance. The Camel district issued licenses for nets last year to the amount of £14, the Fowey of £22 10s., out of a total raised in the kingdom of £4,736.

The last subject demanding mention is the consolidation of the Fishery Acts. Mr. Walpole in his able reports has several times called attention to this matter. In 1880 he wrote that he "conceives there is no higher duty for a person in his position than to urge it." The Bill of last session proposed to carry out this object. A further consolidation would greatly help the consolidation of the law, and would be of perhaps greater service to the fisheries. This is the consolidation of the Fishery Offices. There are separate establishments and different officials for each of the three kingdoms. One policy and one set of men to carry it out would tend largely to efficiency and economy. The present entire separation of the offices is new. The late Mr. Pennell and I served at the same time as inspectors in England and commissioners in Scotland. When ill-health required my retirement from office in 1866 I was serving as chairman of the Irish Special Commission, whose work included the inspector's work, as chairman of the English Special Commission, and as one of the two English inspectors. There is no such variation in the circumstances of the rivers of the three kingdoms as requires any difference of treatment. The policy must be the same for all. The means employed to carry out that policy should be the same, and neither policy nor means can be varied in one kingdom without injury to the other two. If it is not expedient to make any changes in the present arrangements, advantage might well be taken of the retirement of any inspector to appoint one of those in another country to the vacant post. In this way an amalgamation of the offices might be brought about, and uniformity of management obtained. The extended field of inquiry open to the inspectors could not but be useful to those who have to teach, and to the public who have to learn.

FRED EDEN.

THE HISTORY AND FUTURE OF INTEREST AND PROFIT.

THE history of interest, which involves that of profit, is connected with fundamental changes in human society, and in the ideas and feelings on which it rests. It raises, too, economic and social problems of no little importance for the future of the civilised world. Once it was a question wholly of moral and religious sentiment, at length embodied in positive law, whether interest were permissible, and, if so, what rate should subsist. A generation ago in this country all restraint of its rate, together with all other interference on the part of society at large, or the State, with pecuniary dealings between adult men, seemed definitely abandoned. But on the Continent of Europe the legitimacy of interest is vehemently disputed by the adherents of Socialism; a feeling against it is growing up in the United States, and even in England, although no special question about interest has been raised, there are indications of a tendency to revert to ancient ideas on kindred subjects.

The medieval reprobation of interest under the name of usury has often been ascribed to the Christian Church, but its origin may be traced to a much earlier stage of society. Churchmen and canonists doubtless appealed to Christian doctrine, as well as to Aristotle's doctrine that interest is unnatural, because money, unlike corn and cattle, is barren and cannot beget money; and since nothing is lost by the loan of an unproductive commodity, they argued that the lender was in equity entitled to no recompense. But Aristotle himself unconsciously sought to justify a notion inherited from pre-historic times, when the members of each community still recognised each other as kinsmen, when communism in property existed at least in practice, and no one who had more than he needed could refuse to share his superfluous wealth with a fellow-tribesman in want. Tacitus, who remarks that usury was unknown to the ancient Germans, tells also that any one might enter the house of a German and ask for what he pleased; receiving it as a matter of course, and placed under no obligation by the gift. Describing in like manner the ancient customs of the Eskimo, Dr. Rink says that if any one had anything to spare, it was ranked among goods that were possessed in common; and if a man borrowed the boats or weapons of another, he was not bound to give the owner any compensation for damage or loss. The usages and sentiments of archaic communism survived in various forms long after private property even in land had grown up. Far down in the Middle Ages, the rich man who closed his hall-door

and dined in a private room with his family was a byword for extraordinary selfishness and meanness. Many other medieval customs and opinions had their original source in prehistoric tribal and family ideas, and in the practices of a stage of social evolution when each little community deemed itself one in blood and ancestral gods, and individual proprietary rights were most imperfectly developed. The maxim "Natura non facit saltum" is true of the social as of the physical world. The structure of English medieval society, especially on its economic side, had throughout a foundation of which the original type must be looked for in archaic kinship. The guild was a brotherhood bearing all the marks of deriving its organization and fundamental ideas from the ancient joint family. The township or village community had been constituted either by actual kinsmen or by a body of men organized as such. The typical town was an expansion of the township. The nation was an amalgamation of tribes whose tribal ideas survived in various forms. On all sides social structures, practices and notions existed, descending from a time when neighbourhood was scarcely possible without blood relationship or formal adoption, unless in the case of the conquered serf. The feeling of actual kinship might have disappeared in that of membership of a local community bound together by ancient customs, rights and obligations, but neither townsmen nor countrymen could have conceived individuals dwelling in the same place, without bond, connection, or reciprocal duties, each pursuing what life and occupation he thought fit, controlled neither by his neighbours, nor by ancient local usage. The theory of medieval prices had grown out of the archaic idea that the vendor of a commodity or the labourer for hire in a neighbourhood was either a member by descent or adoption of the local community, or its servant, and in either case bound to conform to its usages, to render to it honest and loyal service, and to accept customary or equitable remuneration. And the connection is close between the prohibition of interest and the penalties in the early statutes against forestalling, engrossing and regrating. The forestaller was regarded as seeking an exorbitant profit not by honest work, but simply out of the necessities of a neighbour, who stood in the shoes of the ancient kinsman and had inherited, as it were, the moral rights of one. A man was held entitled to a fair price, determined commonly by custom or authority, for work or produce, but not to a profit on buying or storing up things of which his fellow-townsmen stood in need. Dr. W. von Ochenkowski, in a recent work of merit, *Englands Wirthschaftliche Entwicklung im Ausgange des Mittelalters*, lays too exclusive a stress on the duty which the medieval citizen owed to the State. That duty plays an important part in medieval economy, but Dr. von Ochenkowski overlooks the nearer duty which the burgher owed to the civic body, and the

inhabitant of a township or manor to the little village community and its lord.

The fundamental idea of modern English economy, that every man should be free to follow his own pecuniary interest as he thinks fit without fraud, does not distinctly emerge until the sixteenth century, in which Shakespeare deplored the decline of the loyalty of the antique world, "when service sweat for duty not for mead." Yet we may detect in commercial towns an earlier break with antiquity in respect of dealings between lenders and borrowers. Two opposite practices in relation to the payment of interest co-existed in the fourteenth century, one descending from social infancy, the other developed in the progress of intercourse between mercantile people—among whom moreover the clergy were in no great esteem—by experience of the needs of trade. There were ordinances of the Mayor of London against usury, but they were rarely enforced, and seem to have been chiefly aimed against foreigners and the high rate of interest they exacted. The civic authorities formally sanctioned in the case of citizens what would now be regarded as an enormous rate of interest, and passed accounts in which it was charged, as in accordance with "the custom of the city." The city records show that the fortune of a ward was customarily intrusted to his guardian to employ in his own business, paying interest at ten per cent. Thus in 1374 the account of a mercer was duly presented respecting "£300 belonging to a minor, son of a late citizen, and delivered to the mercer to trade with." The mercer "charges himself with £300 so received, and with the increase by way of profit, four shillings being paid yearly for the use of every pound according to the custom of the city, of which he asks that he may be allowed two shillings in the pound for his trouble, according to the custom of the city."¹ The customary rate of profit is here computed at twenty per cent., the customary interest at ten per cent., or half profit; the rate of profit being "double interest," as Adam Smith says it was in his time, four hundred years afterwards. The Act 37 Edward III. c. xi., which puts merchants, citizens, and burgesses with a capital of £1000 on the same footing in point of expendible income as landowners with £200 a year, proves that twenty per cent. was then considered the customary rate of profit in the commercial towns of the kingdom. It is observable too that ten per cent., the customary rate of interest among the tradespeople of London in Edward III.'s reign, is the rate permitted by the Act of Henry VIII. in A.D. 1546, which first legalised interest, so that it seems to have been still regarded at the latter period not only as the traditional rate, but also as moderate and reasonable.

We must not indeed take the profit and interest customary in

(1) Riley's *Memorials of London*, 378. Compare a fishmonger's account, *ib.* 446, 447.

commercial towns in the reign of Edward III. as representing rates current throughout the country. The profits of agriculture after the pestilence in the middle of the fourteenth century, lowered as they were by the rise of wages consequent on depopulation, could not have borne a rate of interest approaching to ten per cent. on the capital engaged in ordinary farming. Outside of the region of town-trade no regular or customary rate prevailed. Unless among townspeople, money in the Middle Ages was usually borrowed not to make profit, but because the borrower was in need, and the interest was often extortionate. In many cases the penalties on usury prevented loans altogether. The amount of accumulation, moreover, in the Middle Ages was small, and but little of it took the form of coin, the only loanable form of capital, even townspeople commonly investing their savings in land, cattle, sheep, plate, household stuff, and clothing. The amount of capital that could be put into trade was limited in various ways, and save in trade, loans for interest were surrounded with danger, discredit, and trouble. Money too, that is to say coin, was scarce. The English silver mines had become exhausted in the fourteenth century:¹ the Papal See caused a constant drain of treasure; foreign war was another source of pecuniary loss; and base money from abroad supplanted the sterling coin of the realm. Monasteries and great landowners not unfrequently raised loans, but there was so little lending throughout the country, that we may confine our attention to the towns.

Several questions arise with respect to interest and profit in the towns. How did so high a rate of interest as ten per cent. come to subsist in medieval trade? Why did it continue at the same rate, neither fluctuating from time to time, nor declining on the whole, as it has done in modern times? How was a customary profit of twenty per cent. established? The high rate of interest in the Middle Ages has often been ascribed to the insecurity of capital. But unless in foreign commerce—which as yet was chiefly in foreign hands, and in which there was danger of both piracy and shipwreck, and great gains and great losses were made—trade risks were less in the Middle Ages than they are now. Trade in general was carried on in a small, customary, circumspect way, regulated by guilds and civic authority; demand and prices could generally be estimated beforehand; and there was little or no speculation. The rate of commercial interest was not determined by the demand for and supply of money; had it been so, it would have varied from time to time instead of remaining steady at ten per cent. Its explanation must be sought, first of all, in the rate of profit. Modern economists have for the most part assumed that competition proportions prices to

(1) See Dr. Georg Schanz's excellent work, *Englische Handelspolitik, Gegen Ende des Mittelalters*, i. 492—494.

cost of production and equalises profits. Medieval economy was based on very different principles, yet it brought about a much closer approximation of profits to equality, and a much closer correspondence of prices with outlay, labour, and sacrifice. The medieval theory was that the trader owed to the community to which he belonged good articles for reasonable and moderate remuneration, and should not seek his own "singular profit;" while he was, on the other hand, entitled to such profit and prices as yielded a sufficient livelihood to himself and his family—the family forming an important unit in the social economy. In Elfric's Colloquy of the Eleventh Century, the Merchant says, "I say that I am useful to the King and to ealdormen and to the rich and to all people. I ascend my ship with my merchandise and sail over the sealike places, and sell my things, and buy things which are not produced in this land." To the question, "Will you sell your things here as you bought them there?" he answers, "I will not, because what would my labour benefit me? I will sell them dearer here than I bought them there, that I may get some profit to feed me, my wife and children." Anything above a fair profit was regarded, like extortionate interest, as usurious, because out of proportion to labour and cost. Thus the *Ordinances of the Plumbers*, approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of London in the thirtieth year of Edward III., ordain "that every one of the trade shall do his work well and lawfully, and that for working a clove of lead for gutters or for roofs of houses, he shall take only one halfpenny, and for working a clove for furnaces, belfrys and conduit pipes, one penny. Also that no one for any singular profit shall engross lead coming to the said city for sale, to the damage of the commonalty, but that all persons of the said trade, as well poor as rich, shall be partners therein at their desire." There were many ordinances, both royal and municipal, in the fourteenth century for the sale of various commodities "at reasonable prices." The general standard of "reasonable" or fair price and profit was custom. Where the seasons, as in the case of food, or other circumstances made a customary price impossible, the local authorities or the central government itself intervened to prevent sellers from taking advantage of the necessities of buyers. There was abundance of self-seeking and greed of lucre, as well as of hypocrisy, in the medieval world, but they worked not through competition but through combination; towns, guilds, companies, classes, grasping at exclusive privileges, monopolies, and gains. Men pursued their prey, as it were, in troops and packs. What was sought was not the gain of individuals as such, but of communities, corporations, fraternities, and orders.

The causes determining medieval profit may then be easily understood. Its high rate was not the result, as in new countries in

modern times, of a great productiveness of labour and capital, aided by prolific natural agents. In a small, and, compared with our own, a nearly stationary commercial world—where the number of persons engaged in each trade was limited by guild ordinances, or by the governing body of the town, where every business was carried on in accordance with usage or rule, even the amount of capital or work being often restricted, where prices were controlled by custom, public opinion, authority, or positive law—the ordinary rate of profit might be without difficulty measured, indirectly regulated, and kept at a high level. Twenty per cent. came accordingly to be the customary rate of profit in the fourteenth century, and seems to have continued so long afterwards. Again, the customary rate of interest in medieval trade was half profit, or ten per cent., not because the competition of lenders and borrowers resulted in such a rate—for competition would have produced a fluctuating, not a stable or customary rate—but, it may be reasonably conjectured, on the same principle that prevailed in the common European tenure of metayage, that the person furnishing the capital should get half of the produce, and the person performing the labour the other half. Throughout the greater part of Europe down to the sixteenth century, the prevailing rate of interest was ten per cent., and twenty per cent., or double interest, appears to have been the customary profit, at least in common opinion.

The statute of Henry VIII.'s reign (37 Henry VIII., A.D. 1546) which legalised interest at ten per cent., though prohibiting higher rates as usurious, opens a new epoch in the history of the subject. Interest was now distinguished from usury. The same cause that had led the civic authorities of London two centuries earlier to sanction trade loans at that rate, now acted on the Legislature with respect to all loans. Economic considerations prevailed over early moral ideas and later theological dogmas. The extension of manufactures and commerce called for an extension of credit, and interest was the foundation or *raison d'être* of credit. The change was connected too with the Reformation, and the decline of ecclesiastical authority, while the position and influence of merchants and citizens had risen. There was at the same time a general tendency of legislation towards a relaxation of restraints on the disposition and use of property, of which the Statutes of Fines and of Wills are instances; commercial policy and the dictates of experience superseding the notions of both archaic and feudal society respecting the inalienability of family property. Theology recovered ground for the moment in Edward VI.'s reign, when "a Bill against Usury" in 1552 enacted that the late statute sanctioning interest should be "utterly abrogate, void, and repealed." But in 1571 an Act of Elizabeth, following that of Henry VIII., again legalised interest

at ten per cent. Thenceforward the Legislature intervened only to lower the legal rate, which early in the seventeenth century was reduced to eight, afterwards to six, and in the middle of the eighteenth century to five per cent. These reductions might appear at first sight like attempts to tighten restrictions on dealings between lender and borrower, but they simply followed at a distance a fall in the market rate, which always averaged below the legal maximum. During Elizabeth's reign, though the Queen herself at her accession had borrowed at twelve per cent. on account of the supposed insecurity of her throne, the market rate sank far below the lawful ten per cent. Throughout the seventeenth century the usual rate was five per cent. In the eighteenth century the interest on the National Debt stood at one time so low as three per cent. The immense loans contracted by the Government during the long war with France afterwards caused a considerable rise, but the permanent tendency of the rate in modern times amid frequent fluctuations, has been to decline. In the later Middle Ages it stood, as we have seen, at ten per cent., while in the present year, according to the price of the Funds, it has kept close to three per cent. What have been the causes of this fall? What conditions now govern the rate of interest? How are its incessant fluctuations on the one hand, and its decline in the long run, on the other hand, in contrast with its stationary rate in former times, to be explained? Is a continuous fall to be looked for in the future?

Many eminent writers before Adam Smith supposed that the fall in the rate of interest after the middle of the sixteenth century had been caused by the change in the purchasing power of money consequent on the influx of silver from America. Money, they said, was worth less, and therefore, less was given for the use of it. But, as Adam Smith has replied, the change in the purchasing power of money affected both interest and principal alike, and could not alter the proportion. Yet the writers referred to were not wrong in ascribing the reduction of interest mainly to the increase of money, though mistaken in their view of its mode of operation. It was by augmenting, not the sums of money in the market for commodities, but the stocks of money entering the loan market, that the new silver lowered interest. The sudden descent in the market rate in Elizabeth's reign, already alluded to, may be traced mainly to two causes: the increase of silver in Europe after 1545, when the mines of Potosi were discovered, and the new coinage under the great queen. In 1523 it had been computed in Parliament that the total amount of money in the kingdom did not exceed a million. Elizabeth's mint coined more than five millions. Old men, says Harrison, in his description of England in her reign, could remember when it was rare for a farmer to have so much as six

shillings in hand ; whereas, when he wrote, it was common for one to have as much as six or seven years' rent by him, though rents had enormously risen. Little of the coin thus accumulated in the country was put out at interest, but in London and other commercial towns stores of money did not lie idle.

The steadiness of the mediæval rate of commercial interest has already been accounted for by the steadiness of the rate of profit on the one hand, and the fact that half profit was accounted fair interest on the other, in conformity with the principle commonly followed in farm tenures throughout Europe, that the person advancing the capital was entitled to half the produce. According to Adam Smith, interest in his time bore the same proportion to profit. "Double interest," he says, "is in Great Britain what the merchants call a good, moderate, reasonable profit; terms which I apprehend mean no more than a common and usual profit." Whether this estimate was strictly accurate may be questioned. The rate of profit was no longer as certain as it had been under the mediæval system. Nevertheless the philosopher lived in an age in which custom was still "the principal magistrate of man's life." Trade was carried on in the main by customary methods. In old and well-known employments to which he limited the doctrine of the equality of profits, the rate may have been tolerably well ascertained and uniform ; and the steadiness of profit tended to make interest steady. Some of Adam Smith's fundamental ideas, such as the correspondence of price with cost of production, the equality of profits, and that ordinary profit was double interest, had come down from an earlier economic world, many of whose usages and traditions survived. He referred phenomena which were really vestiges of an old stationary economy, to a new and progressive one slowly emerging, under which free competition was about to supersede custom, law, and official control, and to transform a standstill and uniform world into one of infinite diversity and change, and incessant movement. His own observations show that industrial and commercial progress was already creating wide divergence of prices, profits and interest from old standards. The period was one of transition, which at length brought the old economic régime to a close, and established one of which production on a large scale, speculation, unlimited competition, and ceaseless fluctuations of prices, profits and interest are essential features. We are thus brought back to the questions, what are the modern conditions determining the rate of interest, and whether its continuous decline is an inevitable consequence of social progress. These inquiries involve topics transcending the province of economics, but even those that are strictly within it deeply concern the future of the civilised world.

Why then is the rate of interest on the best security only three per cent. in Great Britain, while it is higher in the United States, and even in Holland, formerly the stock example of low interest? The answer which a chapter of Mr. Mill's Political Economy suggests, and which is true so far as it goes, though inadequate, is that the desire and the means of accumulation have led in this country to the existence of a quantity of capital which its owners are led by the preference of other pursuits, or of ease and leisure, above commercial business, to lend instead of personally employing; while there is, on the other hand, a demand on the part of people engaged in trade for loans. The consequent equation of demand and supply results in a rate of commercial interest which indirectly governs the price of the funds and the income from such investments, trade being the chief competitor with Government stock and similar securities for loanable capital. In connection with this explanation, it should be borne in mind that the increasing accumulation is not the only cause that has vastly augmented the supply of loanable capital. The greater part of the movable and immovable property accumulated in a country, in goods, machines, materials, cattle, buildings, and so forth, never directly enters the loan market; and in former times such accumulations would not have affected the rate of interest even indirectly. But banking and credit have rendered the intervention of money no longer necessary to effect loans, unless in a panic. A vast quantity of wealth, not itself directly loanable, is practically converted by credit into productive capital, of which borrowers get the command. The manufacturer and the merchant obtain, through the intervention of banks, advances of the fixed or circulating stock they stand in need of. In former times they must first have obtained a loan of money in sterling coin. Credit, though unfortunately called money in city phraseology, is neither money nor capital, but it acts as the representative of both in the loan market, and has virtually multiplied beyond calculation the supply of loans. Yet vastly as it has augmented the supply, it has not tended only to lower interest, for it has also vastly augmented the demand. The holder of goods can get advances on his stock, and is often a borrower. The operation and activity of modern credit are moreover connected with a system of industrial and commercial enterprise which creates a prodigious need of the loan of capital to carry it on. It is impossible accordingly to lay down any general proposition respecting the effect of credit on the rate of interest. At one time it augments chiefly the demand for loanable capital, and at another time the supply. The difficulty is thickened by the close connection between the action of credit on capital on the one hand, and on the circulation and prices on the other. When credit expands in the loan market, it is active also in the market for commodities, and prices

rise, giving promise of profit; when it collapses in the former, it contracts in the latter, and prices fall, to the discouragement of enterprise. The chief fluctuations of both interest and prices thus find their explanation in credit, which is not, like coin, a given quantity, but subject to sudden expansion and contraction.

When all this has been said, we are still far from an adequate view of the movements of interest. The supply of capital and the demand for it determine the shares of lenders and borrowers in the revenue derived from its employment in business, but do not determine the revenue to be shared. The price of stock and the rate of interest on such securities are governed by the competition of investments of which trade is the chief; and the terms which trade can offer must depend on the expected profit. If the rate of profit anticipated in business be twenty per cent. at the least, a much higher rate of interest will evidently follow a given state of supply and demand in the loan market, than if no higher profit than ten per cent. could be looked for. Interest fluctuates from causes independent of the rate of profit, and bears no fixed proportion to it; sometimes varying in an opposite direction when the immediate need of loans is urgent. But only high profit can permanently support high interest, and low profit can afford only a low recompense to the lender of capital. The rate of profit determines in general both the maximum and the minimum of interest; the maximum must be below it, or the borrower would make nothing, and the minimum must not be so low as to drive the owners of capital to employ it themselves instead of lending it, or to spend it. Thus before we can adequately explain the causes governing interest, we must ascertain those determining profit. For the like reason we can make no answer to the inquiry whether interest tends to rise or to fall in the progress of society, until we have learned the tendency of profit in that respect. In speaking of profit however it is not meant here that there is in modern trade any customary, equal, or average rate, such as is talked of in text books. The mediæval rate of profit was a customary one, and the commercial rate of interest was then a customary one likewise. Now profit is uncertain, variable and speculative; nevertheless interest still bears an essential relation, though not a fixed proportion, to it, being higher when and where high profits are frequent and probable, than where the returns are commonly small. The rate of profit can no longer be described as "double interest," but unless the returns to capital ordinarily exceeded bare interest, and afforded remuneration for its active employment, borrowing in business would cease.

The inquiry whether the rate of profit necessarily declines as the world grows older has a double claim to attention, possessing an intrinsic importance apart from its relation to the future of interest.

Historical and surrounding facts seem at the first view to support the doctrines of those economists who regard a tendency of profit to a minimum as an inevitable consequence of social progress and an established economic law. The actual fall of interest from ten to three per cent. seems presumptive evidence of a fall of profit on the whole hitherto, since interest bears always a relation to profit. And though individual traders now sometimes make more than the ordinary medieval profit of four shillings in the pound, no one supposes that, gains and losses together, profit approaches an average of twenty per cent. on all the capital in trade. In Adam Smith's time the market rate of interest was generally below five per cent., yet merchants thought double interest good profit. The economic world of his day, it is true, resembled the medieval more than the modern world in the narrow dimensions of trade, the lack of movement and change, and the influence of custom. Yet there were essential differences. Prices and profits were not artificially kept to a certain standard by guilds, civic authorities, and laws. A natural tendency of profit to decline from age to age could hardly therefore be inferred from its lower level in the eighteenth century than in the fourteenth. *A fortiori* no such inference can be drawn from a comparison of medieval profit with its rate under the industrial and commercial system of our own time. In the Middle Ages each trade was in the hands of a limited and organized body; capital, competition, and production were subject to various restrictions; prices were customary, or regulated; the total amount of profit was accordingly small, but the rate was high. Under unlimited competition, unrestricted production, and uncontrolled prices, had the state of society permitted of such a system, profit would have varied much in individual cases and in different employments; its aggregate amount might have been much greater, because the amount of capital would have been so, but the mean rate would in all probability have been considerably lower.

If from historical we turn to surrounding facts, the state of trade and agriculture in this country during recent years is regarded by many as indicating more than a temporary fall in the profit of British capital. The novel feature of reduced assessments to the income-tax, especially under Schedule D, and diminished proceeds of the legacy and succession duties, exhibit a retrogression only partially accounted for by diminished incomes, expenditure, and savings of landlords and farmers. But the most prosperous countries, the United States and France for example, have their unprosperous periods. The tendency towards more stringent protection abroad is not to be regarded without anxiety, yet our trade statistics prove that an immense market is still open to our productions, and that British energy hitherto has surmounted opposition. A falling off in

the foreign demand for British produce, such as is sometimes argued from the small proportion of exports, would have the opposite effect of diminishing the proportion of imports, by altering the equation of international demand to the disadvantage of Great Britain. A diminution of exports might result from hostile tariffs, but imports would fall off more. A good market abroad for our exports raises their value measured in foreign commodities, and swells the amount of goods given for them; while a declining demand in foreign countries would compel us to give more for our imports; the ratio of exports would increase, exporters would sell at ever-increasing disadvantage and diminishing profits. Yet even in such an event it could not be inferred that the advance of society lowers the returns to capital, but only that national ignorance and international jealousy may do so in commerce as well as in war. The chief unsoundness in the actual state of matters, and the most threatening indication for the immediate future, lie in two circumstances independent of foreign countries; namely, that our trade is carried on in uncircumspect, over-speculative, and haphazard manner, and that the immense fabric of our system of credit rests on so narrow and precarious a basis that it might suddenly be overthrown altogether. The gradual and spontaneous growth however, with better communication and commercial information, of a better organization of our industrial economy, is not to be despaired of. With respect to agriculture, on the other hand, it is not enough to say with Mr. Bright that adverse seasons have caused the depression of the profits of British farming and the ruin of many farmers. Farming that pays only in fine seasons must be a losing business in such a climate as ours. It is no mere question of sunshine; nor will five thousand or more miles, at which engineers will smile in spite even of Lord Derby, protect the British corn-grower from loss in competition with American produce under present conditions. Cereals however play a minor and diminishing part in British rural economy, and even as regards them, the exhaustion of virgin soil and the increase of population may alter the terms at which the Transatlantic grower can hereafter sell. On the whole, the present situation forebodes no lasting depression of the profits of British capital.

But the question as to the tendency of profit to fall is not to be answered by reference to the particular case of Great Britain, still less its state at this moment. It involves a consideration of the general causes on which profit depends, and the conditions under which they will operate as ages advance and capital accumulates. Adam Smith thought that the mere growth of capital necessarily entailed a fall of profit. "When," in his words, "the stocks of many rich merchants are turned into the same trade, their mutual competition tends to lower profit; and when there is a like increase of stock in

all the different trades carried on in the same society, the same competition must produce the same effect in them all." Were this reasoning correct, profit must inevitably decline in every prosperous country. But there is a flaw in the argument. When in a single trade alone the goods for sale increase, the competition of the sellers may force them to accept reduced prices and lower profits, because the general produce and revenue of the country may not have increased in proportion. But when capital and production take larger dimensions in all businesses alike, all producers have more to exchange, the general revenue is greater, and no class need get less for its goods in the market. It might even be that no increase of capital or production in any pre-existing employment would follow an augmentation of the total amount. A new trade was a rare thing in Adam Smith's days; now scores grow up every year, and new trades may both absorb much new capital and create new markets for the produce of old trades. If the growth of capital lower profit, it must be either by raising wages, or by forcing resort to inferior or more costly instruments of production.

A later theory of a tendency of profits to a minimum, is that an increased cost of subsistence follows the advance of population, so that, to obtain a sufficient supply of labour when capital is increasing, employers must raise wages and submit to a decrease of profit until a stationary state is reached at which the further increase of capital is arrested. This theory is defective in two opposite ways. On the one hand, it omits all but one of the causes tending to a depression of profit; on the other, it overlooks both counteracting agencies, and the possibility of a change in the fundamental conditions determining the movement of population. The soil in the first place is not the only natural agent whose productiveness diminishes. Mines of all kinds would be exhausted even by a stationary population, whereas the productiveness of agriculture would increase with agricultural skill, were the number of consumers to remain constant. The cost of land too rises for all purposes of production, and not in agriculture alone. Many employments again besides agriculture yield diminishing returns to successive applications of capital, because the best places are taken by the first-comers, and those who come later must work in worse situations. The first roads, canals, and railways in a country are usually those, as M. LeRoy Beaulieu has observed, between the chief centres of population, wealth, and business, and traverse the districts where traffic and movement are greatest, later lines of communication running through poorer and less populous localities. The best sites for docks, wharves, warehouses, shops, and other places of business are, for the most part, the first occupied. When any new and lucrative enterprise is started, or any invention or novel production is

introduced, a crowd of competitors follow, and profits fall off. Nor is an increased cost of food the only cause tending to raise wages ; it is not the cause that has raised them in England during the last twenty years. Facilities for migration, emigration, and combination, together with greater intelligence, knowledge, and self-respect on the part of the working classes, have produced the rise.

Yet there is another side to the subject. The rate of profit depends on the ratio of the gross returns to the total outgoings ; on the cost and efficiency of all the instruments of production—not of labour alone. Given the entire produce of the capital, labour, and natural resources of a country, in order to ascertain how much is profit, we should know not only how much falls to the share of human labourers, but also how much must be applied to the maintenance of fixed and circulating capital, including animals, seed, materials, fuel, machinery, buildings ; how much too must be paid as rent for the use of natural agents ; and how much is to be deducted in taxation and legal expenses, or what is the cost of protection and of the other advantages of government. In a country whose natural resources are abundant and prolific, efficiently co-operating with capital and labour at small cost, and whose government and legal system are inexpensive, both wages and profit may be high. If the soil and climate be favourable, mines of all kinds rich and easily worked, the structure of the country lending itself to cheap and rapid locomotion, taxes and law costs small, it is plain that the return to capital, alike in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, may give a large surplus in profit, although at the same time the reward of labour is abundant. And what the bounty of nature may effect may be effected by the art of man. Better machinery may be applied at once to the factory, the farm, and the locomotive : while chemistry cheapens and improves the cultivation of the ground, it may do like service in every branch of manufacture. Less costly and more efficient means of heating and lighting every place of production and business may be discovered. The general rate of profit might thus be sustained by the progress of science, though population were advancing. No speculation respecting the economic future of the civilised world which does not take account of the inexhaustible resources of science, and of the progressive development of the human faculties for discovery and invention, has now much claim to attention. Labour, in the narrow sense, is not as political economists as well as “social democrats” have assumed, the sole cause of profit. There might be production and profit without the employment of a single human labourer, and profit in that case would be greater or less, according to the qualities of the other agents, and the manner in which they were used. A company in a new colony where hired labour was not to be had, might carry on a great

business by the aid of animals, machines, and natural agents; the profit depending partly on the cost, partly on the powers of these animate and inanimate coadjutors. And the progress of industrial art constantly augments the number and efficiency, and diminishes the expense, of some of these auxiliaries. The fact that the best steam engines still waste the greater part of the fuel, is enough to show that the field for economic invention in mechanics is immense. Again, if it be true that the first railways are the best situated, and bring in the largest returns, it is true also that commerce and industrial movement have a constant tendency to spread, and to create markets and traffic where there had been stagnation. The tendency of many great enterprises, like the Suez Canal, is to become more remunerative. Fifty years ago, the farthest-seeing mind could not have formed a conception of the profitable occupations that steam would provide for fresh accumulations of capital, and steam is perhaps a feeble agent compared with some future sources of power. The facilities for the migration and emigration of labour may tend to raise wages at the expense of profit, but they are connected with causes which constantly enlarge the sphere for capital in the application of neglected or imperfectly developed resources, both in old and new regions. The overflow of British capital to foreign countries has two aspects. Mr. Mill has contemplated it as a sign of the fall of profit in old countries, but it may be regarded also as an example of the tendency of social progress to find fresh fields of employment for their accumulations. Students of Mr. Herbert Spencer's works know moreover that there is reason to question the undiminished fecundity of the population of the civilised world, which the theory of a decline of profit assumes. Civilisation makes constantly greater demands on the nervous system, enlarges the brain, and multiplies its expenditure of physical power, thereby diminishing the quantity expendible on the increase of the race, while at the same time raising the standard of wants, and augmenting prudence. One and the same cause, the increase of cerebral force and activity, and therewith of science, foresight, and adaptation of means to ends, tends to add to the industrial productiveness of the people of the West, and to slacken the growth of their numbers, although a different future may be before the people of the East. The time must indeed come, after countless ages, when the decline of solar and terrestrial heat shall arrest the mental advancement of the human race, and make the returns to capital and industry dwindle. But within economic, as distinguished from astronomical and geological periods, there seems no ground for concluding that in the more civilised parts of the globe man must press constantly closer and closer on the means of subsistence, and thrift and enterprise consequently obtain a decreasing reward. Were population stationary,

it may perhaps be argued, the price of labour would rise to such a pitch from the accumulation of capital as to leave little or no profit. The answer is, that the accumulation would not take the form of wages, but of new mechanical and other agencies for aiding production, which would benefit the labourer as a consumer without raising the cost of his services. One remote difficulty indeed raises a formidable, and at present insoluble problem, namely, what is to be done for coal and iron when the mines become exhausted? Yet the men of a former age might have regarded the disappearance of forests, and the consequent rise in the cost of wood, with equal embarrassment. It is at least certain that the earth contains resources, now undreamt of, which science is sure to reveal; or, rather, which the mind of man, the real cause of all wealth and profit, is sure to discover. Some of the chief sources of modern profit must ultimately fall short, but food is not likely to be among the number, because the number of human beings can be kept within bounds—as it is already in France and among the old American families in the States of New England—and substitutes for those which must fail may be in the womb of time. No certain conclusion respecting the future of profit can be reached, but the theory of its tendency to a minimum has no claim to the character of a law of social progress, ignoring, as it does, some of the chief results of that progress, and its chief cause, the constant improvement of human faculties. Profit may uniformly fall from its first high level in new countries like the Western States of America, yet may not continuously decline in old countries. The rate will probably vary from time to time in the future as it has done in the past.

If profit then be subject to no law of inevitable decline, can interest be so? It is almost needless to say that no inference can be drawn from its lower level in modern times than in the Middle Ages, since the medieval rate of profit was fixed, and interest bore a fixed proportion to it. Now profit is indeterminate and fluctuating, interest too fluctuates from causes independent of profit, affecting the loan market, such as the state of credit, the foreign exchanges, the movements of bullion actual or anticipated, the harvests, Government and foreign loans, and political events and prospects. The movement of interest in trade may consequently be different from, and even opposite, for the moment, to its movement in respect of other investments. The price of Government stock might be high, and interest on such securities falling, while the rate of discount showed that men of business were eager for loans, either because credit had been shaken, or because a shock to it or a scarcity of money was apprehended, or, on the other hand, because a speculative mania had arisen. Or again, people in trade might be slow to accept short loans on

very favourable terms, because waiting for a turn in commercial affairs, while stable and permanent investments like the funds or land mortgages returned a high interest. Yet the main cause determining, throughout the whole field open to capital, the general tenor of the movement of interest, is the rate of commercial profit. Let new channels of trade offer bountiful returns for a series of years, and the savings of the country would flow into them, the price of Consols would fall, and mortgagors would pay dearly for loans. The main reason why the rate of interest has been constantly higher in the United States than in England is that the prolific natural resources of America have afforded a richer field for the employment of capital than was found in this island. The chief cause of the rise of interest in Holland is that Dutch capital has found in colonial undertakings, American investments, foreign commerce, and husbandry at home, more profitable employment than lay open to it a century ago. And the stationary state ultimately reached by the whole civilised world may possibly be that of a stationary population, whose savings are more productively employed than those of the present generation, and yield a higher interest.

We have yet to consider how profit is distributed between lenders and borrowers of capital, and what proportion falls to the share of the former. Gross profit, according to Mr. Mill, is made up of three elements: interest or the reward of simple abstinence, insurance or the compensation for risk, and the remuneration for superintendence or management. This analysis however errs in treating insurance as a constituent of profit. The sum spent in insuring the goods of a manufacturer or merchant against fire or shipwreck forms part of his outgoings, not of his profit upon them. He may spend what he receives both as interest and as recompense for management, but what comes to him as insurance should be laid by to provide against accident or loss, and is not expendible income. It is true, since losses and accidents may be escaped, that men in a trade exposed to them who do not insure may get a higher profit from the higher prices caused by the risk. They have played double or quits and have won. But if all risk in trade, and therefore insurance, could be extinguished, the total amount of profit would not be diminished, as it would be by the extinction of interest, or of the earnings of management. On the contrary, were the same amount of insurance required in all trades alike, its elimination would be a saving, and a source of additional profit all round. The mistaken classification of insurance with the elements of profit, instead of with those of cost of production, is connected with the common inaccuracy of treating interest as higher in proportion to risk. Interest proper is net income, and safely expendible as such; the provision against loss of the principal is not so. As in

the case of profit however, particular lenders may be gainers by the risk of losses which do not actually befall them, though nothing may be gained from it by lenders all round. How far risk attracts or repels capital depends indeed partly on national character and the temper of the age. But the presumptuous trust in their own good fortune which Adam Smith imputes to the greater part of mankind, tends to make the losses resulting from risk exceed, on the whole, the indemnity.

Profit then includes two elements only, interest for the mere loan of capital, or an equivalent where the capital is the employer's own, and the additional return resulting from its active employment in production. This second element is not happily called wages of superintendence or earnings of management. Regarding it in that light, Mr. Alfred Marshall and some eminent foreign economists consider it simply as a species of wages, determined by the same causes that govern the recompense of skilled labour in general, such as the rarity of the faculties and acquisitions required, and the amount of toil undergone. Were there no other constituent than this, in addition to interest, in gross profit, interest would absorb a greater share of profit than it does, and therefore be higher than it actually is. The surplus above interest arising from the active employment of capital is in proportion, not to the difficulty and trouble of management, but to the amount of the capital. If two companies, one employing twice as much capital as the other, can make a good profit by selling at a particular time or place, the gain of each will be in proportion to the business done and the amount of the sales; and one will make twice as much as the other, although the skill and exertion required to conduct the operations in the two cases may be the same. There may be a manager of each company who gets a fixed salary, and this doubtless is wages; but the profit on the transaction will be so much per cent. on each company's capital, and may far exceed the manager's pay. The shares of interest on the one hand, and of the return for the employment of the capital on the other hand, are determined by the supply of and demand for it in the loan market. The proportions will vary in different countries and ages, according, in a great measure, to the attraction or repulsion that active trade has for the owners of capital. The rate of interest in short is determined by no invariable rule; but like that of profit, seems subject to no law of inevitable decline, at least until great astronomical and geological changes supervene, and the whole solar system begins to approach the end of its career.

So far the future of interest and profit has been considered with reference to economic conditions alone. But is it certain that economic conditions exclusively will henceforth control them? The policy of society in reference to both has been determined by various

conceptions. Archaic notions and feelings founded on kinship, Greek philosophy, Roman law, Christianity, Catholic theology, commercial ideas, the modern regard for individual liberty, political economy, have all played a part in their history. Other sources and modes of thought have yet to be reckoned with—democracy, the views of the working classes, German and French Socialism, the subtler shapes of Socialism which ostensibly seek only to enlarge the intervention of the State in the economical sphere, and new conceptions of moral and social duty. The authority of the economic theory hitherto dominant with respect to individualism, competition, and non-interference, is visibly shaken even in England. The notion that all capital should belong to the State for the benefit of the working classes has many strenuous adherents in Germany and France, notwithstanding the wide distribution of property in those countries, but for which it would have already overcome all opposition. The favour with which Mr. Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* has been received in the United States makes a curious revelation of the tendencies of educated thought in a country where individual energy has worked under the most propitious conditions. Mr. George indeed proposes to confiscate land rent only without compensation, but rent in a vast number of cases is virtually a form of interest, being the return to an investment by purchase or outlay. Protection, again, is a revival of the medieval regulation by law or authority of trade, prices, and profit; and the policy of most civilised countries is protective. In England, a generation ago, when at length Bentham's *Defence of Usury* had led to the abolition of a legal limit to interest, much more seemed to be swept away. The change apparently formed part of a wider and deeper change in social opinion and legislative policy, and belonged to a general movement of thought, emancipating human conduct from a multitude of ancient restraints in the name of morality or religion. Yet, little as people are dreaming of it at present, there are indications of a tendency on the part of English society to slide back to the medieval system of regulating contracts, bargains, pecuniary dealings, and prices by authority. Fair wages, fair profits, and fair rents are now objects more or less distinctly conceived by many who, ten years ago, regarded buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market as the sole rule in all questions of contract. No one perhaps in England at this moment thinks of controlling interest, yet propositions are now often put forward respecting wages and profit involving the regulation of both, and indirectly therefore of interest, which follows the movement of profit. Ten years ago no English statesman would have listened to a proposal to regulate rent in any part of the United Kingdom by statute or judicial decision. Yet the principle of the Act by which judicial rents are now introduced into Ireland is no

other than that of the medieval law against usury, that the owner of property should not be permitted to take advantage of his neighbour's necessity, to extort a high price for the loan of it. The establishment of rings and corners, and of bulling and bearing in English trade, might considerably alter public opinion with regard to the medieval laws against forestalling and engrossing. Democratic legislation will assuredly intervene in directions not in accordance with the doctrines that have commended themselves hitherto to the minds of great capitalists or landowners. Ideas of moral and social obligations too seem likely to play a greater part in the commercial sphere than they have ever done since Adam Smith based a complete economic code on the desire of every man to better his own condition, and some of these ideas may make light of that code.

The misfortune is that great general principles, like that of the freedom of contract, are now abandoned in a moment to promote a particular measure, perhaps expedient or necessary in itself and defensible on special grounds, like the Irish Land Act. Medieval economy has been ignorantly decried; there was much in it that was good in design and suited to the time; yet let us not ignorantly go back to it from a notion that we are following new and advanced guides. Let us look steadily before us, and if we are to revert to an ancient system which tolerated no individual liberty in production or exchange, let us at least do so advisedly and deliberately, not sliding back into it unconsciously.

T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE great event of the month has been the sudden and remarkable extension of the policy of repression in Ireland. The Coercion Act gave a legal sanction to the exercise of arbitrary arrest. That sanction, however, was strictly limited to cases in which the Government reasonably suspected "individuals of certain specified descriptions of offence," seven in number. Until the 12th of October Ministers interpreted the Coercion Act in its natural sense. They denied that they had any more right under the Act to arrest any man in Ireland who did not commit one of the specified offences than they had to arrest the Lord Mayor. The popular conception of the Coercion Act, that it gave the Government *carte blanche* to lock up every man whose conduct was mischievous and gave them trouble, was not more inconsistent with the clauses passed by Parliament than it was with the Ministerial conception of its meaning prior to the 12th. On that date everything was changed, and the Government decided to adopt and execute in Ireland an entirely new set of legal and constitutional prerogatives. Instead of arresting those whom they suspected of committing offences specified in the Act, they decided to arrest all those whose language or writings seemed to them likely to incite others to commit such offences. They began by arresting Mr. Parnell. They followed it up by arresting Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, and a host of other leaders of the Land League. Arrests continue, and before the meeting of Parliament almost all the active members of the Irish party will be under lock and key. Such is the latest development of the long-continued failure of the English government of Ireland.

The accepted plea for arresting Mr. Parnell is that he was preventing the Land Act from having a fair trial. That Mr. Parnell personally would like to burke the Land Act is probable enough. His object is to make Ireland too hot for us, and anything which tends to satisfy the Irish people and reconcile them to English rule removes to that extent the ground on which he stands. But although that may be Mr. Parnell's object, it is one which he dares not prosecute openly, and in pursuing it he has been obliged to resort to tactics which exposed him to a probability of disastrous defeat. His position was one of extreme difficulty. Confronted by a measure of agrarian reform which, in the opinion of Mr. Dillon, conferred such "immense benefits" upon the Irish people that, "if the League attempted to

prevent the people trying the Act, it would be found impossible," Mr. Parnell was compelled to sanction an experiment, the result of which, Mr. Dillon predicted, would, in a few months, take all the power out of the League and render it difficult, if not impossible, to carry on its revolutionary policy. The purse-bearers of the League in the United States were emphatic in demanding that the Land Act should not be tried. Telegram after telegram was flashed across the Atlantic, "Accept the Act, and we cut off subscriptions. Reject it, and we double them." Like many other leaders, Mr. Parnell tried to guide the movement which he could not arrest. Instead of committing himself to a policy of uncompromising antagonism to the Act, he decided upon another course, the choice of which displayed his customary adroitness. At the great representative Convention of the Land League, held in the Rotunda on the 5th of September, the new policy was explained and defined. Mr. Parnell claimed—he quite justly claimed—for the League all the good that was in the Land Act, and proclaimed that, instead of "boycotting" its own offspring, the League would devote its resources to testing the Act with the view of extracting from it all the benefits which it contained. At the same time he developed with much ingenuity a revolutionary theory—based upon the Land Act's recognition of the principle that no rent should be raised on the improvements of a tenant, and on a peculiar version of "the unearned increment"—that the only fair rent for land was the original value of the land before the original tenant first began to improve it. The value of Irish soil as it was left by the Flood, Mr. Parnell appraised at half-a-crown an acre. If it is more valuable now, it is due to the labour of successive generations of tenants, and the "increased increment" of value arising from the increased wealth of the country to which the landlords for the most part contributed nothing. The rental of Ireland, now estimated at seventeen millions, ought, Mr. Parnell maintained, to be reduced to its Flood value of two or three millions. This preposterous standard of "Fair rent" was inculcated at all the Land League meetings, and farmers were exhorted not to apply to the Land Court until they saw how far the Commissioners' conception of a fair rent approximated to the Parnellian estimate of the current rental in the days of Shem, Ham, and Japhet. While diligently accustoming the Irish mind to this ideal, Mr. Parnell proposed, and the Convention approved, that test cases should be selected all over Ireland, which the League would submit to the Court (no "American money" being appropriated for that purpose), and until the decision of the Court had been given, the farmers were exhorted to pay no rent and to refrain from going into Court. As soon as ever the Convention was over, Mr. Parnell, fearful lest the decision to try the

Act should alienate the sympathy—and the subscriptions—of the Irish in America, telegraphed to the *Irish World* that it had been determined to test the Act, in order to convince the farmers that it was useless. This ingenious excuse illustrates the difficulties of Mr. Parnell's position, and the devices to which he was driven to keep his following together.

The selection of test cases was begun. Mr. Healy, Mr. Parnell's right-hand man, published a popular digest of the Land Act, explaining how the tenants could best make use of its provisions. The Catholic Bishops, in conclave assembled, eulogised the Act, thanked its authors, and urged their flocks to avail themselves of it to the utmost. The Commissioners issued a brief but simple summary of the salient features of the Act, and distributed it through the post-office in every nook and corner of Ireland. Long before the first sitting of the Court, which was fixed for the 21st of October, it was evident that the Commissioners would have more than enough to do. Ulster was going into the Court without waiting for test cases. Nor did Ulster stand alone. In the west the decision to apply to the Court was general. No fewer than six hundred farmers in a single district had instructed a solicitor to bring their cases before the Court. In the west, the Special Commissioner of the *Tablet* reported a universal willingness to invoke the intervention of the Land Act, and to accept it as a settlement of a prolonged and exhausting crisis. The test cases of the Land League mounted up to four hundred and fifty; but even without one of these there was not only enough but even too much work cut out for the Land Court.

Considerable disorder continued to disturb many of the districts where the landlords were evicting tenants who refused to pay their rent, but the outrages were not of a very appalling character, and they were provided for by the Coercion Act. A Government armed at its own request with the absolute right of imprisoning on suspicion every perpetrator of outrages, and commanding the services of fifty or sixty thousand well-armed men, might safely be left to deal with the only too familiar manifestations of agrarian discontent. The Land League exercised great authority. It had secured the passing of the Land Act. It promised to extract for tenants all the advantages of that measure, and it held out a prospect of amending it in the future if it were found faulty. The Peasants' Union of Ireland, strong in number and cohesion of members, abused its new-found power, and frequently prostituted to private ends the authority which should have been employed for the general weal. The Coercion Act which was to have destroyed it had consolidated its power, and by taking up the demand for the release of the suspects the League was able still further to strengthen its hold upon the Irish people.

But among all the outrages for which it is held responsible, but which in reality were often committed against its orders, there does not appear to have been one attributed to a desire on the part of its executive to keep the tenants out of the Land Court. The English mind, however, chafed against the disorder which prevailed in Ireland. The popular impatience was not lessened by the triumphal receptions accorded to Mr. Parnell in the south of Ireland, and each day's budget of reports of violence and outrage swelled the rising tide of passion and disquiet. All this while the law-abiding, property-respecting members of the Irish nation made no protest against the semi-socialistic doctrine preached everywhere by Mr. Parnell, and took no energetic measures to combat on the platform or in the press the theories of the Leaguers. Like the lazy bulldogs of Bombay, which are carried up and down stairs by native servants until they lose all power of mounting the steps themselves, the party of order in Ireland lay supine, wondering how long the Government was going to stand this kind of thing, but lifting neither tongue nor pen in favour of honesty, patience, and observance of the law. The Emergency Committee and the Property Defence Association did good work, but the moderate Home Rulers, the Liberals and the Conservatives of Ireland, all the respectable classes in short, did nothing, or next to nothing, to combat the terrorism of the League, or to dissuade the people from giving ear to the promises of Mr. Parnell, by demonstrating their absurdity or by exposing the injustice which they would involve.

The Government continued steadily in its selected path, administering the Coercion Act in the old lines, and releasing from time to time suspects in whose districts outrages had ceased. Father Sheehy, one of the most violent of the sacerdotal firebrands of Ireland, who had been imprisoned at Kilmainham for inciting to intimidation, was released at the end of September. Boycotting continued, but no attempt was made to deal with it as picketting is dealt with in this country, and the violent attacks of tumultuous mobs on the soldiery and the police were not repelled as they might have been with "buckshot and bayonets." Evictions were steadily persisted in for the non-payment of rent, and although the country was somewhat disturbed, the Land Act had not come into operation, and the means at the disposal of the Government were ample for keeping the peace.

Mr. Gladstone visited Leeds in the second week in October to return thanks for his unsolicited return at the General Election, and the third of his six speeches he devoted entirely to Ireland. The speech was one which, with the exception of its concluding portions, might have been well delivered in Ireland by an Irish patriot. It exposed

the sinister counsels of Mr. Parnell, it contrasted his devious course with the career of O'Connell, and it appealed to the "wealthier portion of Irish society" to throw off "the sluggishness and incapability" which unfortunately have become its traditional characteristics. Mr. Gladstone expressed his conviction that the Irish nation desired to take free and real advantage of the Land Act, and denounced as cowards those who despaired of Ireland. But Mr. Parnell had said that any man who paid his rent till the test cases were decided, showing how much rent he ought to pay, was a fool, and to be called a fool by the President of the Land League was a dangerous thing, which "must afford the greatest temptation to misdeeds." The Government were determined that "no force, no fear of force, and no fear of ruin through force," should prevent the Irish people from having the full and free benefit of the Land Act. If, therefore, when they had some short further experience, it should appear that there was still to be fought the final conflict in Ireland between law on the one side and sheer lawlessness upon the other—if the law, purged from defect and any taint of injustice, was still to be violated, and the first condition of political society to remain unfulfilled, then Mr. Gladstone said to them, without hesitation, that the resources of civilisation were not yet exhausted. "I shall recognise in full when facts are ripe—and their ripeness is approaching—the duty and the responsibility of the Government." Few ventured to anticipate that the period of grace would be so short. Lord Salisbury, with his customary felicity of refined sarcasm, displayed his patriotic devotion to the supreme interests of the commonwealth three days later, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, by suggesting that Mr. Gladstone was to Mr. Parnell as Catiline was to Cethegus—Cethegus, by the way, was the assassin sent by Catiline to murder Cicero—and expressed his belief that the "new resources of civilisation," foreshadowed by Mr. Gladstone, were "a new and eloquent sermon from the lips of the Prime Minister." That was on Tuesday, the day before Mr. Parnell had replied to Mr. Gladstone at Wexford in a speech which was full of angry taunts and bitter words, and with the contentions of the Irish agitator Lord Salisbury seemed much more to accord than with the speech of the Prime Minister of the Crown.

On Wednesday, the 12th October, the Cabinet met. It sat for four hours. When it broke up one of those decisions had been taken which affect the destinies of empires. The next day the Prime Minister announced at the Guildhall the arrest of Mr. Parnell, amid the "tremendous cheering" of a crowd which, five years before, had cheered as vociferously and for the same reason Lord Beaconsfield's deification of British interests. He proclaimed it to be "the first step towards

the vindication of law and order, of the rights of property, of the freedom of the land, and of the first elements of political life and civilisation."

The arrest of Mr. Parnell was welcomed with exultation in Germany and Russia. The press of Berlin and St. Petersburg noted with grim satisfaction that a Liberal Government had been constrained to resort to the "*mesures de rigueur*" which form the most familiar weapons of European despotisms. In the United States, the press at first approved and then bitterly condemned. In France, the action of the Government was approved by the more moderate Republicans, and vehemently censured by the extremes of both wings. The Ultramontane and the Intransigent agreed in denouncing the latest development of English government in a Catholic country seething with agrarian discontent. M. Clemenceau's organ, in condemning the arrest, remarked that the English Government, now fairly started on the arbitrary road, would find it difficult to arrest its march.

Events promptly supplied a confirmation of the French Radical's foreboding. Mr. Parnell, who was speedily joined at Kilmainham by Mr. Dillon and Mr. Sexton, decided upon replying to the Government by ordering a general strike against rent. The manifesto—a remarkable document in its way—in which this new departure was set forth, declared that the Government, baffled by the law-abiding self-command of the League, and unable to declare the Land League an illegal association, had resolved to destroy the whole machinery of the Central League in order to render an experimental trial of the Act impossible. Under these circumstances, "The Executive, forced to abandon the policy of testing the Land Act, feels bound to advise the tenant-farmers of Ireland from this time forth to pay no rents under any circumstances to their landlords, until the Government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism and restores the constitutional rights of the people." This course was described as lawful and constitutional, and what was more to the point, it was declared that "against the passive resistance of an entire population military power has no weapons." They can no more coerce a whole nation than they can "imprison them." "Pay no rents," continued the manifesto, "under any pretext," for thereby would the Government learn how "powerless armed force is against the will of a united, determined, and self-reliant people." Copies of this manifesto were dispatched to each of the two thousand branches of the Land League, accompanied by this placard:—

"No Rent.—By order of the Executive. Signed, Charles S. Parnell, President, Kilmainham Gaol; A. J. Kettle, hon. secretary, Kilmainham Gaol; Michael Davitt, hon. secretary, Portland Prison; Thomas Brennan, hon. secre-

tary, Kilmainham Gaol; John Dillon, head organizer, Kilmainham Gaol; Thomas Sexton, head organizer, Kilmainham Gaol; Patrick Egan, treasurer, Paris."

The Rev. Mr. Cantwell, who presided at the meeting of the League at which it was resolved to post this placard, alluded significantly to the share which the priesthood were expected to take in heading the resistance of the peasants to the payment of rent. Archbishop Croke, however, who had hitherto been one of the most thoroughgoing Land Leaguers of the episcopate, showed no disposition to allow such a movement to rely upon the support of the Church. In a manifesto which created a good deal of surprise on both sides, he declared that he had been filled with "absolute dismay" by the resolution to pay no rent, and he there and then dissociated himself publicly and formally from all future participation in the proceedings of the Land League.

The executive of the Land League had declared in their manifesto that they had hitherto rendered it impossible for the Government to dissolve the League as an illegal association, by the scrupulous care with which they had kept themselves within the four corners of the law. Whether they intended it or not, the immediate result of this declaration in favour of No Rent was to give the Government an opportunity of which it was not slow to avail itself. A proclamation was launched from the Castle on the 20th inst. declaring that the Land League was "an unlawful and criminal association," and that "all meetings and assemblies to carry out or promote its designs or principles are alike unlawful and criminal, and will be prevented, and if necessary, dispersed by force." The following is the preamble explaining and justifying this exercise of authority:—

"Whereas an association styling itself 'The Irish National Land League' has existed for some time past, assuming to interfere with the Queen's subjects in the free exercise of their lawful rights, and especially to control the relations of landlords and tenants in Ireland, and whereas the designs of the said association have been sought to be effected by an organized system of intimidation, attempting to obstruct the service of process and execution of the Queen's writs, and seeking to deter the Queen's subjects from fulfilling their contracts and following their lawful callings and occupations; and whereas the said association has now avowed its purpose to be to prevent payment of all rent, to effect the subversion of the law as administered in the Queen's name in Ireland."

Not quite a fortnight before the appearance of the proclamation, the Prime Minister had referred to the Land League at Leeds. He then said, "I do not like to speak to you, and shall not speak to you of the Land League as embodying principles hostile to order and peace in Ireland, because dangerous as that association

has brought itself to be, yet I am convinced that it has many members, and perhaps many local branches, who have no views but the attainment of lawful and reasonable objects." The transition was sudden and violent, and it is significant of the change produced by the new departure of the Government. To dissolve a public association by administrative decree is unparalleled even in Ireland. The Catholic Association was dissolved by Act of Parliament. The League has been suppressed by an edict from the Castle. On the whole it is better that the arbitrary measure should not be cloaked by any disguise of popular government. Ireland is not governed on popular principles, and nothing but harm is done by maintaining a sham constitutionalism as a salve to the English conscience. If we must govern Ireland in this way, it is better that the work should be done by proclamations from the Castle than by Acts of Parliament passed by an assembly in which the voice of the Irish people is heard only to be stifled by the overwhelming majority of a hostile race.

In saying this, we do not mean that the measures which the Government have felt themselves called upon to take may not have been justified by the exigencies of the situation. What needs to be impressed upon the English people is the true character of a situation which could only be dealt with in this way. It is our duty as a nation to face the position in which we stand to Ireland; how odious it is, how incompatible with our pretensions to be an example to the world of constitutional freedom and political success. For the moment it is the business of a Government to preserve a kind of order, and to insist on respect for law. If they had persuaded themselves that there was about to be a widespread refusal to pay rent (the rents due at Michaelmas), then two courses were open to them. One was to use the troops and to fire on the crowds who offered resistance. The other was to suppress the organization which was supposed to be at the back of the movement. Which course was the less likely to leave a lasting resentment behind it? The opinion of the Government was that the arbitrary imprisonment of the leaders, and the suppression of the League, though certain to leave a bitter taste behind it, would still be less likely to leave passionate memories of this kind than the shedding of blood. If these were the alternatives, the policy of the Government was prudent and defensible.

Towards the end of the month the German elections will show how far Prince Bismarck has succeeded in his endeavours to outbid the Socialists in their appeals to the sympathies of the masses. In France M. Gambetta has already had an interview with the President, with a view to his acceptance of office; but Parliament will not meet till the 28th, and M. Gambetta naturally entertains the strongest

objections to take over the *damnosa hæreditas* of M. Ferry in Africa and elsewhere, before the newly elected Chamber has pronounced its opinion upon the demerits of the Ministerial policy. In Tunis the French have occupied the capital, and have begun their march on Kairwan. A two months' campaign, say the optimists of Paris, will bring the war to a close; but their anticipations have been so uniformly disappointed, that no surprise need be expected if Christmas should find the Arabs still in the field. In Italy the Pope is still creating some uneasiness by threatening to leave the Vatican. He professes to feel unsafe in his splendid prison, and there is some talk of his flight to Salzburg. Malta also has been mentioned, but Austria would probably be preferred to British territory. It is doubtful how far the rumours, which come from Rome, are to be trusted. The removal of the Holy See from the Eternal City is too serious a step to be lightly undertaken, and Rome is likely to remain for some time to come the ecclesiastical centre of Christendom.

The chief European event of the month is the death of Baron Haymerle, the Foreign Minister of Austro-Hungary, which occurred quite unexpectedly on the 10th inst. Baron Haymerle, like his predecessor, Count Andrassy, was condemned to death for his participation in the revolutionary movement of 1841. He lived to be the chief man in the Empire-Kingdom, after the Emperor-King. Baron Haymerle rose rapidly to the highest dignity in the Austrian service. But his talents were by no means brilliant, and his term of office has not been distinguished by any remarkable display of statesmanship. Its chief characteristic was the submissive resignation with which the Foreign Minister of Austro-Hungary played second fiddle to Prince Bismarck; and second fiddlers in the European orchestra are forgotten almost as soon as they quit the theatre. The choice of his successor is a somewhat difficult matter. The balance of forces within the dual realm is so delicately adjusted that a mistake in selecting a Minister-President might produce a general upset. The difficulty is, however, less than it seems. The Hapsburgs are their own Foreign Ministers. The Haymerles, and even the Andrassys, are little better than the agents of their sovereign's will; and it is not to be expected even if Count Beust were to return to office, that he would effect anything more than a modification in detail of the Hapsburg policy.

A very brisk discussion has been going on during the month as to what that policy really is. The discussion was opened by a well-known correspondent of the *Times*, who propounded the theory, based upon his own deductions from the information gathered during a prolonged sojourn in Eastern Europe, that the Austrian policy is that of annexation, not only as far as the *Ægean*, but even as far as

the Mediterranean. He affirmed of his own knowledge that active preparations were being made for the advance to Salonica, and he maintained that sooner or later the whole of the West Balkan States would be engulfed in the Austrian system. Serbia commercially is already little better than an enclave of its powerful neighbour. Are iron hands to be put round Montenegro? Arrangements have been entered into—so his story goes—between Austria and Russia for the Austrian annexation of the whole of Macedonia; and Austria, commanding the Ægean and the Adriatic, would advance southward until the kingdom of Greece shared the fate of the Northern Principalities. The story, like many other stories of the partition and redistribution of empires, would have attracted little notice but for the commotion which it created at Vienna and Pesth. If the plans for the annexation of Greece had been lying in the pigeon-holes of the Austrian War Office, the story could not have been more passionately and repeatedly denied, and so manifest was the consternation in high quarters in Austria-Hungary, that people began to attach more importance to the disclosure of alleged Austrian designs than would otherwise have been the case. In the discussion that ensued many strange theories were broached, but none which afforded much ground for consolation to those who hope that the small nationalities of the Balkan may be allowed to feel their way as best they can to a higher form of civilisation than that which they at present possess. The favourite theory in the quarter where the discussion originated is, that Austria will seize Avlona to secure command of the Adriatic, that Italy will retort by occupying Corfu, and that Austria will then descend to Arta, and Greece will fall a prey to the advancing Hapsburg. Such a programme is rather extensive, and many men will have to die before such a readjustment of the European equilibrium is finally completed.

If Austria is descending not only to Salonica but to the Piræus, so much the more reason is there, argue the heralds of her approach, that England should seize Egypt. But England is not going to seize Egypt. The control of England and France, established by the late Government, is sedulously preserved by Lord Granville, who turns a deaf ear to all suggestions that tend to the isolated action of England in the Nile Valley. The military meeting has been tided over. Two Turkish Commissioners have put in an unwelcome appearance at Cairo, and although both England and France not only demanded their recall at Constantinople, but emphasized their displeasure by dispatching ironclads to Alexandria, it is reported that they did not leave Egypt without extracting from the amiable but timid Tewfik a promise that he would at an early date seek investiture at the hands of the Sultan at Stamboul. The

Western Powers naturally look with the gravest suspicion upon everything tending to strengthen the authority of the Porte in Egypt, and the controllers of Egyptian finances cannot but regard with displeasure the exaction of a ceremony which will probably require a sum of £500,000 or so upon the exchequer of the Khedive.

At the other extremity of Africa, the obstinacy of the Boers created some uneasiness. The Volksraad objected to ratify the Convention, which had been accepted by their leaders. They appealed to the Home Government, stating their objections to almost every clause which reserves to our representative the right of exercising an *imperium in imperio* in the Transvaal State. To these objections the Imperial Government replied promptly, by insisting upon the ratification of the Convention, and emphasizing their demands by preparing for a renewal of hostilities. The Volksraad, thus menaced, did at last ratify the Convention under pressure of *force majeure*. When our troops are withdrawn, they will try to treat it as waste paper, which is perhaps the best thing that could happen to it.

Across the Atlantic it would seem that the bitter memories of a struggle waged a century since by an obstinate monarch with his revolted colonists were being succeeded by a fraternal appreciation of the wants of the English race. The surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown was celebrated on the 19th by the descendants of the victors with every demonstration of national rejoicing. At the close of the imposing ceremony, the following remarkable order of President Arthur was read and obeyed with hearty good-will:—"In recognition of the friendly relations so long and so happily subsisting between Great Britain and the United States, in trust and confidence of peace and good-will between the two countries for all centuries to come, and especially as a mark of the profound respect entertained by the American people for the illustrious Sovereign and gracious lady who sits upon the British throne, it is hereby ordered that at the close of these ceremonies, commemorative of the valour and success of our forefathers in their patriotic struggle for independence, the British flag shall be saluted by the forces of the army and navy of the United States now in Yorktown, and that the Secretary of the Navy shall give orders accordingly." The thunder of that salute is the most pleasing sound that the contemporary annalist has to chronicle this month.

Oct. 25th, 1881.

THE
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CLXXX. NEW SERIES.—DECEMBER 1, 1881.

ATHEISTS IN PARLIAMENT.

WHATEVER else the coming year may have in its keeping, the Bradlaugh question is sure to reappear as soon as Parliament meets. In the first instance, indeed, there can be no repetition of the last and most unpleasing of the scenes to which that question gave rise. The order under which the member for Northampton stands excluded from the precincts of the House of Commons expired with the session in which it was passed, and in February Mr. Bradlaugh may again present himself at the table and claim to take the oath. But the feelings which this demand excited in 1881 will probably prove equally beyond control in 1882. Consequently, it is in the highest degree expedient that the Government should be prepared to deal with the difficulty before it has again become acute. If they allow matters to take their course, the controversy which Mr. Bradlaugh's appearance at the table originally excited will be revived in all its old force. That is not a prospect which any one who values the dignity of Parliament can contemplate without pain ; but it is one that will certainly be realised if the Government do not, as soon as Parliament meets, give notice of their intention to deal with the question by a Bill.

It will be maintained, no doubt, by many Liberals, that it is not the business of the Government to touch the matter at all. In the two last sessions, they will say, the House of Commons, under the insidious guidance of the leader of the Opposition, wandered beyond its proper province, and arrogated to itself the right of determining whether the electors of Northampton had made a proper use of the franchise. At the beginning of the session the House will find itself, by no merit of its own, brought back within the frontier which it should never have overstepped. The Government have no right to take for granted that the old mistake will be repeated. On the contrary, they will be bound to resist any attempt to go behind Mr. Bradlaugh's declared readiness to take the oath, and to call upon the House of Commons to bear them out in their resistance. There may be others, Conservatives as well as Liberals, who, while not prepared

to go the length of denying that the House of Commons was justified in its original exclusion of Mr. Bradlaugh, will hold that the reason on which the House then acted has been so weakened by time that it is no longer prudent to rely on it. When Mr. Bradlaugh was first prevented from taking the oath, his avowal that oaths were to him unmeaning had only just been made. But the House of Commons has no means of investigating Mr. Bradlaugh's mental history during the two last years. Its own journals can tell it nothing, and it is certainly not to be desired that it should supply the deficiencies of the journals by administering direct interrogatories to Mr. Bradlaugh. For anything the House of Commons knows to the contrary he may now be a convinced theist, and if it is inexpedient to ask him whether he is, and unjust to assume that he is not, no alternative remains but to allow him to take the oath, and to square matters with his conscience as he best can.

I have never been able to see much force in the first of these arguments. That the House of Commons was right in its original refusal to let Mr. Bradlaugh be sworn, seems to me a matter of plain common sense. The wrong alleged to be done to the electors of Northampton was a wrong of their own manufacture. If they chose to return a member who was unable to take the prescribed oath they had only themselves to thank. No doubt Mr. Bradlaugh had declared himself willing to take the oath. But the difficulty related, not to his willingness, but to his competence, and upon this latter point the House of Commons decided that a mere recitation of the words by a man who had avowed that his religious opinions deprived them of all meaning, was not a taking of the oath under the Statute. The technical right of the House of Commons to pronounce this decision can hardly be disputed. It is established by the simple fact that there is no higher tribunal to which the case can be carried on appeal. Nor has it ever been shown that the decision was materially wrong. It is said, indeed, that there are other members of the House of Commons who believe no more than Mr. Bradlaugh, and that if they have been allowed to take the oath, there could be no reason for forbidding him to do the same. But there is all the difference in the world between the man who does not refuse to take part in a ceremony which he privately thinks unmeaning, and the man who insists upon taking part in a ceremony which he has publicly declared to be unmeaning. The one respects the popular conscience, the other outrages it. In this respect Mr. Bradlaugh's position at the time of his election was exceptional, and no wrong was done in recognising and treating it for what it was. It is true, of course, that the House of Commons has no business to make inquisition into a man's religious opinions. But in Mr. Bradlaugh's case, when it first came before Parliament, there was no need to make any such inquisition. In the spring of 1880, at all events, his

religious opinions were public property, and among them was 'one that deprived of its principal value a condition which Parliament has thought fit to attach to the taking of a seat in the House of Commons. From this point of view the oath may be altogether worthless, but, so long as it is retained, it cannot fairly be made a grievance that a man who has publicly proclaimed it to be worthless is not allowed to take it.

In the second argument, however, there is a great deal of force. If Mr. Bradlaugh is again kept out of his seat by a resolution of the House of Commons, one of two things must happen. As there is no public authority to whom he can make a formal recantation of his doctrine about oaths, the House of Commons, in the absence of any such recantation, must either treat him as excluded from taking the oath on the score of opinions which he may no longer hold, or condescend to accept informal evidence as to the extent to which he still holds them. It will hardly be contended that either of these courses is consistent with the dignity of Parliament. In the one case a serious wrong may be inflicted on Mr. Bradlaugh and on the constituency which has chosen him as its representative; in the other case the House of Commons would be doing secretly and indirectly what it is universally admitted that it ought not to do openly and directly. Yet if Mr. Bradlaugh is, session after session, to be kept out of his seat by a mere resolution, there is no escape from one or other of these conclusions. If there be any who really desire his exclusion by this method, they cannot have seriously considered the dilemma in which it will land them.

It does not follow, however, that because the House of Commons ought not to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh from taking the oath, the simplest and best way out of the difficulty is that he should be allowed to take it as though nothing had happened. I do not deny that this course would have some advantages. To treat Mr. Bradlaugh's appearance at the table as an incident which has no unusual antecedents, and consequently does not need to be dealt with by any unusual methods, would certainly be a saving of time and temper. It is not easy to say beforehand how much resistance an Atheist's Relief Bill would encounter in its passage through Parliament, but it is at least possible that it would evoke a very much stronger and more passionate opposition than Liberals in general seem to acknowledge. Upon this question alone Mr. Gladstone has seen his vast majority fall to pieces. The Dissenters are still an important element in the Liberal party, and though the working-class voters, who as a rule perhaps care little about religious questions, are far stronger in point of numbers, the Dissenters have the advantage in point of organization, enthusiasm, and the habit of political action. It is quite possible, therefore, that the Conservative opposition would on

this occasion be reinforced by a large contingent from a section of the electorate which has hitherto been exceptionally zealous in its support of the Government. The argument against the admission of atheists to Parliament is different in kind from the argument against the admission of Roman Catholics and Jews, and the recognition of this difference may go far to break up the unanimity which the Liberal party has ordinarily shown upon questions which concern religious equality. There can be no doubt, indeed, as to the ultimate success of the Bill, but it is quite on the cards that it might be defeated in the session, and even in the Parliament, in which it was first brought forward, and defeated by a schism in the party which brings it forward. This may not be a very serious calamity even from a party point of view. The victorious opposition would be united on no other question, and the loss of the Bill would not involve the resignation of the Ministry. But Ministers themselves cannot be expected to regard the question quite in this light. It is not pleasant for a Cabinet to find itself at issue with those whom it has been accustomed to count among its best friends, and of late years the Bills which Governments have been able to carry even with their majority unbroken have not been so numerous as to dispose them to saddle themselves with measures upon which they are not unlikely to find themselves in a minority. Even if the Liberal party should not be divided on this question, the loyalty of some of its members would be put to a very severe strain, and loyalty thus treated sometimes breaks down unexpectedly upon some other question which in itself is of little importance. It is quite natural, therefore, that the Government should see grave objections to this way of disposing of Mr. Bradlaugh.

Nor is it only the Government that has good reasons for disliking the introduction of an Atheist's Relief Bill. Those for whose benefit the Bill is intended may fairly regret that the question should be raised in this particular way. The admission of atheists to Parliament is not so universally popular a proceeding that its advocates can wish to see it taken in hand under exceptionally unfavourable conditions. As Mr. Bradlaugh's peculiar theories of sexual morality have been adopted of his own free choice, there can be no impoliteness in saying that they are not of a kind to make his religious opinions popular. The zeal of the House of Commons in this business has not been entirely theological. In the first instance, at all events, it was evoked, not so much by the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh happened to be an atheist, as by the fact that the atheist seeking admission happened to be Mr. Bradlaugh. Nor is Mr. Bradlaugh's desire to be relieved from swearing when he thought that he could take his seat without it, coupled with his willingness to swear when he found that he could not take his seat without it, specially calculated to endear him to his countrymen. It has an ugly likeness to playing fast and loose with an obligation

which a large number of Englishmen still hold to be sacred. It is difficult to imagine O'Connell maintaining that his duty to the electors of Clare justified him in using words which implied that he was a Protestant, or Baron Rothschild offering to be sworn "upon the true faith of a Christian" when he found that the true faith of a Jew would not answer his purpose. A Bill to enable atheists generally to sit in Parliament without taking the oath will be identified in the popular imagination with a Bill to enable Mr. Bradlaugh to sit in Parliament without taking the oath, and from the associations connected with such a Bill atheists of a different temper may naturally wish to keep themselves free. It is quite conceivable that for different reasons theists may be equally anxious not to have the question fought out on its merits. The introduction by the Government of a Bill to permit atheists to sit in Parliament will be a startling testimony to the general decay of belief. It will imply that atheism has ceased to be an occasional eccentricity, and has taken its place among the recognised categories of English opinion. More than this, the fact that formal provision has been made for the entry of atheists into the legislature will tend to drive people into defining their religious position. Since the admission of Jews into the House of Commons the oath has practically ceased to have any theological meaning. It is one that can be taken by men of all forms of religion, except Quakers, and it came as a surprise to most of us when it turned out to have a disabling force as against Mr. Bradlaugh. But when atheists have been expressly relieved from taking the oath, the oath itself will assume a new character. It will be retained—if it is retained—because it is understood to have for those who take it a specific theological sanction, and when no one is obliged to be sworn unless he likes, it will come to be regarded as hypocritical for men to take it unless they accept that theological sanction. Though men will not become atheists because atheists are no longer under any political disability, they may be led by the removal of that disability to consider with themselves whether they are theists. That is an inquiry which may sometimes have unexpected and far-reaching consequences.

Yet when all these objections to dealing with the question by direct legislation have had their due weight assigned to them, they will be found altogether insufficient to outweigh the objections to which the alternative method is open. If no fresh order is made on the subject, and Mr. Bradlaugh is allowed to take the oath, he will owe his seat not to any change in the convictions of the House of Commons, but to its inability to make its convictions operative. The majority which once excluded him will still think that he ought not to be admitted; it will still be prepared to refuse him admittance if he would but give it the opportunity. Nor will the nation at large set much store by the distinction, logical rather than practical,

between allowing a man to be sworn because the House has no means of ascertaining what his opinions about the oath are, and allowing him to be sworn because his opinions about the oath are not such as need hinder him from taking it. The common view will be that though the House of Commons knows that Mr. Bradlaugh thinks the oath a mere string of unmeaning words, it is still perfectly willing that the oath should be administered to him. In other words, Parliament will be made to appear a consenting party to a *de facto* profanation of an oath. This is not a satisfactory method of disposing of a question which involves the ultimate sanction of morality. Only criminals can gain by oaths continuing to be administered while they are treated at the same time as of no real account. The time may have come for reconsidering the relations between citizenship and belief in a God, but those relations ought not to be dismissed as though they were not worthy of definition.

A second objection to letting Mr. Bradlaugh take his seat without specific legislation is that it withdraws a great question from the judgment of the community. The admission of atheists to Parliament involves questions of far more moment than the admission of Roman Catholics or Jews. The two latter measures, violently resisted as they were, had no consequences of any moment except as regards the Established Church. But the presence of atheists may conceivably touch the very foundations of society. Hitherto the commonwealth has been fenced about with two distinct sanctions—one temporal and one spiritual. The temporal law has enforced its edicts by temporal penalties; it has punished perjury, for example, with fine and imprisonment. The spiritual law has enforced its edicts by spiritual penalties; it has threatened the oath breaker with the anger of an outraged God and the hell reserved for faithless men. There has been no instance in Christendom—it may almost be said no instance in the world—of a community trusting only to the dread inspired by the temporal sanction. But if atheists are admitted to Parliament, Englishmen will, so far as the legislature is concerned, have become such a community. They will have ceased to hold in any corporate or recognised way that, over and above the punishments inflicted by the hangman and the gaoler, there are others which may follow after the hangman and the gaoler have done their worst. Human justice with all its necessary imperfections and failures will be for the future all that they profess to look to for the restraint of criminals. However the controversy arising out of Mr. Bradlaugh's claim to sit in Parliament may or ought to be decided, the issue which it raises is one of immense reach and importance. As such it is one upon which the country has the clearest right to pass judgment. The contrary view is inconsistent enough with the professed principles of both the great English parties, but it is especially inconsistent with Liberal principles.

A change that touches, or may be supposed to touch, the whole community ought not to be effected behind the back of the community. But if atheists are allowed to sit in Parliament in any other way than by a measure introduced into the legislature, and, if need be, submitted to the constituencies, this is exactly what will have been done. A change that interests the whole community will have been effected almost in silence, because there is reason to fear that if properly laid before the nation it would provoke an amount and kind of remonstrance which it would be difficult to put aside. No greater violence to the conditions of democratic government can be conceived than the subordination of an issue of this magnitude to considerations of party convenience. The only justification that can be alleged for admitting atheists to Parliament without first ascertaining that it is the will of the electors that they be admitted is that, where the object to be attained is good, it is well to compass it by any means that present themselves. On this theory, it being a good thing to allow atheists to take their seats, and the quickest and surest way of doing it being to administer the oath to Mr. Bradlaugh, he should be sworn without loss of time. To raise the wider issue whether the nation wishes to have atheists in Parliament, would be unnecessarily to risk defeat. By-and-by the community will be wiser, and then it will rejoice that its representatives had the good sense to do it an unasked service, and to anticipate the gratitude which it will feel at some future day. Reasoning of this kind would be in place in the mouth of a benevolent despot, but it cannot be used with decency by men who call themselves Liberals. The more doubtful they feel as to the fate of a Bill to allow atheists to sit in Parliament, the more incumbent it is on them not to introduce atheists into Parliament without a Bill. The electors have at least a claim to be protected against sharp practice on the part of those to whom they have given their confidence. If it were perfectly certain that the Bill would be passed, the case might be different. It might then be argued that, as the mind of the electors was already made up, it was unnecessary to take up valuable time in giving effect to a foregone conclusion. But to make the action of Parliament on a given question perfectly certain, there must be an extraordinary accumulation of evidence on one side and an entire absence of it on the other. Can it fairly be said that this is the fact as regards the admission of atheists to Parliament? The influence and example of Ministers have not usually been powerless in the present House of Commons; how is it that they have gone for nothing when the question at issue was whether Mr. Bradlaugh should be sworn? I do not say that the dislike to letting Mr. Bradlaugh in by Act of Parliament would be as strong as the dislike to letting him in without an Act of Parliament; that is a point which can only be decided by experiment. Nor do I say that the feeling of the existing House of Commons on the subject would certainly be

shared by the electors. It is not necessary for my purpose to assert either of these things. All that is wanted to make out an unanswerable case for dealing with the question by Bill is that there should exist a reasonable doubt as to what the fate of this Bill would be. If there be any one who denies that such a doubt exists, he is bound to explain why on this theory Mr. Bradlaugh has hitherto been prevented from taking his seat by a resolution of a Liberal House of Commons.

Here the question might very well be left. But it is possible that the argument for introducing an Atheist's Relief Bill, in preference to simply allowing Mr. Bradlaugh to take the oath and so letting the controversy slumber, may seem stronger when it is urged by one who is himself in favour of admitting atheists to Parliament. For this reason I propose to indicate shortly why, in the event of such a Bill being brought forward, I hold that it would be well to pass it. I am not brought to this conclusion by any considerations of abstract right. A community is free to make any stipulation it chooses as to the terms upon which admission to, and continuance in it, shall be enjoyed. If Englishmen prefer that England shall be a nation of theists and of theists only, they may fairly use the liberty which belongs to the members of every partnership to determine who shall be admitted to and who shall be excluded from the enjoyment and administration of the common fund. Nor, if we were now constructing an ideal state, would there be any adequate reason for admitting atheists to a part in it. Unity of religious belief is an excellent thing in itself, though it is a modern fashion to despise it, and if it could really be secured by legislation it would be a very fitting object for legislation to aim at. But we are not now constructing an ideal state, or considering who shall and who shall not be admitted to the enjoyment of citizenship. Nobody proposes that there shall be a general deportation of atheists beyond the seas, or that they shall be denied any single privilege which is possessed by other Englishmen save only the right of sitting in Parliament. Some strong practical reason ought to be shown for excluding them from the governing body of the community when they are not excluded from the community. It is often urged that such a reason exists in the fact that they have a different moral standard from that which is recognised by theists. But this is not a practical reason for excluding them unless the difference is one which touches the particular work which a legislator has to do. Undoubtedly there are functions for which an atheist would be unfitted by the mere fact that he is an atheist. He could not, for example, teach morality to the children of theists, because the motives to which he would appeal and the sanctions by which he would enforce his lessons are essentially different from those recognised by the children's parents. But the business of legislation has

reference to aspects of morality on which atheists and theists stand on common ground. The State has nothing to do with sins, it is only concerned with crimes; and it is in the region of sins, not in that of crimes, that the distinction between atheistic and theistic theories of morality becomes important. An atheist jury and an atheist judge would be perfectly competent to condemn and sentence a murderer. The rights of property are just as sacred in the eyes of atheists as in those of theists. It does not matter that the one holds that over and above the penalties attached by society to murder and robbery there are other and more enduring penalties attached to these same acts by a yet higher authority. The legislature is only concerned with the former class of sanctions, and if theists and atheists are agreed upon the propriety of punishing certain crimes because they are hurtful to the community, it does not matter that the one believes, while the other does not, that besides being hurtful to the community they are displeasing to One greater than the community. I am not at all disposed to make little of the difference between the two moralities. All I contend is that in the region with which modern legislation deals that difference is almost inoperative.

And if there is no strong practical reason for keeping atheists out of Parliament, there is certainly a very powerful reason for admitting them in the fact that, do what we will, we shall only succeed in keeping out the best while letting in the worst. Let it be granted that the rejection of an Atheist's Relief Bill will be taken by all honest atheists as a sufficient indication of the mind of Parliament on the subject, and that so long as the oath continues to be demanded as a condition of taking a seat, they will abstain from presenting themselves at the table. Unless we are to credit atheists with very much stricter notions of morality than are universal among theists there will be many among them who, provided that they are asked no questions, will volunteer no information, and will find their religious opinions not in the least an obstacle to their taking any oath that is offered them. What will the House of Commons gain by excluding atheists who have a high sense of personal honour and are determined, where their individual advantage is concerned, to err on the side of over-scrupulousness, while it admits atheists to whom the fact that their individual advantage is involved supplies a more than adequate motive for keeping their opinions in convenient obscurity? No means of excluding this latter class can possibly be devised, and if it be let in while the former class is kept out, the nominal identification of membership of the House of Commons with belief in a God will have precisely the reverse effect to that which it is presumably intended to have.

D. C. LATHBURY.

KIOTO.

HE who would study and understand Japan must yet, in spite of all that has been written about the country, go there in person, and read not the chapters of French or English, or even of painstaking German authors, but those of Japanese actuality and life. Many and various are these chapters; and not one of them but the attentive reader may derive from its perusal much to instruct and interest. From none will he learn so much at so little cost of time and labour as from that of "Kioto," the city of the Mikados, the ex-capital of Japan. Among many cities of high fame, Kioto stands alone in the universality of its memories. Kamakura, the city of Yoritomo and the ill-famed Hojos; Osaka and its Cyclopean citadel, the burial-mounds of Sakai, and the pleasure temples of Enoshima; Nikko, with its stately mausoleums and statelier pine-groves, the mountain-shrines of Minobu, the peerless slopes of Fuji; these, and scores of other spots that might be added to the list, have one and all their spirit-stirring memories and their surviving beauties wherewith to reward the visitor; each one is indeed a picture where a scene, fascinating in itself, is rendered yet more so by the skilful touches of a first-rate artist, till the beholder knows not which most to admire—the subject selected for the painting, or the execution of the painting itself. But Kioto, like some all-comprehending panorama wrought out by a cunning hand, sums up in itself at once the past and the present, the beauty and the decay, the glory, the eclipse, the resurrection, all the changeful history, all the varying thought, all the elaborate art, the whole body and soul of Japan; itself the faithful mirror of the great Empire centred there.

"The living robe of the Deity," to borrow the magnificent metaphor of Goetho's *World-Spirit*, is woven of many threads, each thread a people, a nation; nor among all these many threads of life is there any of closer texture or stronger fibre than the Japanese. Yet this, too, when carefully examined, will be found to be made up of many strands, finely intertwined, and at times almost identified, then again differentiated into distinctness; each one a master-idea, a national fact: while, among the rest, two, more marked in their texture, more important than the rest, demand special notice. Oldest in time and strongest is "Shinto," the first and most vigorous expression of the purely Japanese mind; its formula, the well-known "Kojiki," is even yet to Japan what Homer was to classic, Virgil to mediæval, the Bible to Protestant England, Darwin to the Europe of our day. Alone and undisputed it swayed Japan for at least a

thousand years, till its rival power, Buddhism, entered on the scene some thirteen centuries ago, and while itself strangely modified by the primal Japanese influence, modified in its turn that influence still more. To these two main strands in the Japanese thread a third, best designated by the vague but convenient, because readily understood, phrase of "European civilisation," has recently been super-added; in what degree, however, and to what result, is still uncertain; for the present it is an ungraceful incongruity, from which we willingly avert our eyes.

And what is "Shinto?" A Chinese compound word, adopted in general use as a curt equivalent of the Japanese "Kami no michi," or "Way of the Deities," the original phrase; it is in the thing implied a religious system, which, like religions in general, is made up of two parts, the one mythology, the other precept. The dominant idea on which both these are based is the correlation, if not the absolute identity, of all natural and external forms, man included, with spiritual or divine powers. This idea again is limited, and rendered in a manner definite, by a mythological scheme in which Japan figures as the centre of the entire system, the apex of its perfection, holding thus in "Shinto" both in regard of the country and its inhabitants much the same position that is occupied by Greece and her islands in the Homeric, or rather the pre-Homeric system of the Achæans and their kindred tribes. Lastly, while the entire Japanese race is assumed to be akin to and intimately connected with the cosmic deities, their direct descendant and representative among men is no other than the reigning Mikado himself. So much for the mythology of "Shinto;" its precepts follow in logical sequence, and are summed up in reverent conformity to the laws of nature, intense patriotism, and obedience to the Mikado.

Such being in its ultimate analysis the "Way of the Deities," it is no wonder that its true significance and the influence it has exerted should have proved an enigma, not merely to the shallow bigotry of narrow-minded "missionaries" and their half-educated associates, but even to men of considerable research in Japanese and oriental scholarship, the mental attitude habitual to either class precluding them from seeing in its true perspective the object of their consideration, in which the former sought what they are pleased to call a religion, the latter an elaborate mythos. In the precise sense attached by modern European thought to each of these words, Shinto is neither; it is less in a manner than the former, and more than the latter. The solution of the riddle of the universal, the dogmatic answer to the endless questionings of "Whence?" and "Whither?" an all-mighty, all-creative, all-ruling Deity, a rigid code of moral and religious observances and duties, a conscience of sin, a "thou shalt not" writ up over every door, a future of exceeding great

promises and yet greater threats, none of these are its portion ; no teacher, divine or otherwise, has summed it up in his person ; no author-deity set it forth in a book ; no images tenant its shrines, no mediators its heaven, no everlasting burnings its hell. Of all these it has no need. It is by its own showing a mere setting forth of facts, some existent, some handed down by record, but none external to this visible universe, and an injunction of obedience to the laws that govern and to the lessons taught by them, the whole having special reference to Japan. These facts are, according to its traditions, the formation and governance of the Japanese island-group by spiritual powers, partly gods and goddesses, of fire, water, earth, air, food, the sun, the moon, and so forth, partly deified heroes or heroines from among the Japanese themselves, and, as a natural consequence, the pre-eminent dignity of the Mikado, who is the lineal descendant of the sun-goddess herself. Beyond this all is but slightly touched on or absolutely ignored by "Shinto" as not to its purpose.

Its direct conclusions or precepts we have already seen ; the indirect ones, whether positive or negative, are alike in their sequence. There is no room in "Shinto" for idols, the gods themselves being ever present in their embodiments or their works, the sun, the moon, the elements, or in the person of the Mikado, and, by communicated right, of his relatives and officials. Nor is there any need of a written revelation where nature herself, "without, within, above us and around," is the ever-open book wherein the will of the gods and the gods themselves are to be read ; nor needs there any definite code, preceptive or prohibitory, where man's own nature, maintained in harmony with the nature around him, is man's own all-sufficing law ; nor a redeemer or mediator, where everything is divine and right of itself ; nor of dogma, where the appeal is not to assertion, but experience, not to theory, but to fact. Shinto temples and Shinto festivals do indeed abound throughout Japan ; but the latter are mainly commemorative, the former mere localisations of reverence and of spiritual power ; Shinto priests, too, in numbers sufficient, though not excessive, for the temple service, but they vow no celibacy, form no caste apart from a people which is not less akin to the gods than they ; no blood-shedding, no sacrifices are needed to reconcile in one those who have never been sundered ; only offerings of devotion and respect, emblematic maidendances, types of purity imaged to view in white strips of paper dependent from the temple eaves, and a few other symbols of like simplicity in character, which I will describe together with the temples themselves further on. To sum up "Shinto" is Japanese nature-worship in its most absolute form ; patriotism its first duty, the laws of nature and the high deeds of Japanese ancestors its moral

code, the Mikado its centre and embodiment, a noble life and admission among the demi-gods its reward. Such is its plan.

More than a thousand years had passed over what may be not unreasonably called historical Japan, when the second strand was added to the thread of national life. This was Buddhism, that mighty form which had bound at least half the Turanian world to its sway, and having reduced China, now in the seventh century of our era, invaded Japan. Unfortunately it came not in its original singleness of purity, but in its gorgeous Chinese travesty of pomp and ceremony, hagiology and legend, formula and spell, attended by a crowd of saints, hermits, monks, angels, demons innumerable, and the whole Hindoo Pantheon in its train. Buddha himself, Amida Butsu for the Japanese, was now, in his true semblance at least, as completely eclipsed by his retinue as ever Christ could be by Virgin or Saint in a Calabrian village. But though the central figure of the system had well-nigh disappeared, the central idea of Buddhism, the inherent depravity of man's nature, and his need of supernatural renovation and redemption, remained in full force; nor were its fatal effects long unmanifested. Weakening at once the self-reliance and self-respect of the Japanese, weakening too their old straightforward trust in the good gods of the nature around them; undermining even their loyalty to his heaven-sent ruler, nay more, that ruler's own belief in his own self, it contributed more than any other cause to the decline of the Mikado's authority, and the consequent anarchy, with its evil but necessary outgrowth of organized feudalism and military despotism, in the end. With the knowledge of sin too came the law of multiplied and onerous precept, a caste priesthood, and a social hierarchy of Indo-Chinese pattern. Yet for two full centuries Shinto, though betrayed and abandoned by Imperial folly, retained its hold on the common people, wiser in their day than their rulers, throughout the greater part of Japan, till the Chinese-taught craft invented that strange compromise by which Shinto itself appeared to blend with and merge in Buddhism; and the two systems thus confused gave birth to a monstrous compound that retained whatever was childish or injurious of each, omitted whatever was beneficial and reasonable. Fortunate it may truly be said to have been for Japan when the bitter bigotry of the priest Nichiren in the thirteenth century violently dissolved the unholy alliance, and the inherent antagonism of priesthood and caste to patriotism and nature stood revealed beyond all possibility of future compromise or reconciliation. And in very truth Buddhism never was and never can be otherwise than antagonistic to Shinto, always in principle, often in fact. But trees are best known by their fruits, and the most perspicuous commentary on the two rivals who yet dispute the religious and, to a certain degree, the

political allegiance of Japan, is to be read in the city and the palace, the castle and the temples of Kioto. Let us study it there.

The vorsifier—who he was I know not, but he must have been a poor creature to my thinking—who after comparing the world to an inn, proceeds to say—

“ Many I hear, and some I see,
I naught to them, they naught to me,”

can never have numbered a Japanese inn among his travelling experiences. The provident care of the worthy Governor of Kioto has installed myself and my companion, a young English-speaking Japanese official of the “Gaimusho,” or Foreign Office, in a comfortable hostelry, where we occupy a suite of small rooms, opening into each other by the ordinary sliding-screens, and looking out through an open verandah across the clear rapid waters of the Kumo-Gawa torrent where it traverses this quarter of the town. But we are by no means solitary ; some three or four Japanese wayfarers, guests at the same inn and lodged in the neighbouring apartments, having already at this early hour, after the country custom, begged and obtained the honour, as they elect to term it, of wishing us a good morning. Seated together we enjoy the view of gardens and temples clustering half-way up the slopes of the wood-clad hills that separate between the Kioto valley and Lake Biwa famed in song, and help each other by turns to diminutive cups of that most refreshing of all drinks ever invented by man, fresh Japanese tea. Next a visitor of quality is announced ; and the Governor’s chief secretary presents himself at the opening of the screen ; and after much exchange of ceremonious courtesy on either side, befitting the gentry or “Samurai” class to which he, in common with most of his rank, belongs, takes a place in our little circle squatted round the tea-things, and offers his services on the Governor’s behalf as guide to the sights of Kioto. For five days he will be our constant attendant, and will leave nothing unsuggested or undone that can contribute to our personal comfort and to the ends of our journey. And here let me remark once for all, that though the prescriptions of Japanese etiquette are many, and even onerous at times, it is not in these formalities that the much talked-of Japanese courtesy essentially consists, but in the modest self-restraint of demeanour, the promptness to oblige, the unsleeping care to avoid whatever might by any possibility annoy or offend, and the peculiar gentleness of tone and manner which render the Japanese, whatever his rank or position in society may be, so truly a model “gentle” man, in the proper and authentic sense of the word. No less completely is the Japanese woman, high or low,

lady or serving-maid, a gentle woman even after the exacting Petruchio's own heart. But to continue.

Quaint little folding maps, such as abound for sale in every Japanese town, have been produced for inspection, and Kioto and its environs carefully studied, till the plan of our daily campaign having been accurately determined, we descend, escorted *honoris causa* by the landlord and an indefinite number of followers, mostly housemaids, to the street door. Here six sturdy fellows are in waiting to pull, two apiece, our "jin-riki-shas," vehicles of recent introduction, but now universal throughout Japan, and which, for the benefit of those who have not seen or sat in them, may be described as exaggerated perambulators of the hansom-cab type with shafts, and drawn for short distances by one, for longer by two, and occasionally three men, tandem-yoked, at a pace averaging, and not rarely exceeding, five or six miles an hour.

Of all their surface qualities—I use the word "surface" not as excluding "substance," but rather implying it—none is more noteworthy among the Japanese than their cheerfulness at work. It is a quality shared by all classes, and common to all employments. The Japanese statesman dictates a dispatch or discusses a cabinet question with a smile on his face; the financier, more astonishing yet, smiles over the intricacies of a deficient budget; the preacher smiles during every pause in his sermon; the writer at his desk; the shop-keeper smiles while chaffering with his customer, the servant on receiving his master's orders, the smith while forging the metal, the potter manipulating the clay, the husbandman as he wades knee-deep in mud across the rice-fields, the bargeman propelling his clumsy boat against wind and tide, the coolie straining to lift the heaviest load, nay, even the convict at his forced labour by the roadside. And what is more, a very slight occasion will broaden the smile into a hearty laugh. All this is true and genuine good-humour, based firstly, no doubt, on a good digestion, but also on a remarkably elastic temperament, great courage, and the sound good sense that everywhere and everyhow makes the best of things. Had Mark Tapley been somewhat more of a gentleman in manners he might have passed for an average Japanese.

In the qualities just touched on, as in whatever else pertains to Japanese gentility and refinement, the inhabitants of Kioto are, on all hands, allowed to excel. Of the town itself, through the long, wide, straight, well-paved streets of which we are now passing at such a pace as the busy marketing crowd of morning permits, neatness, cleanliness, and what may, by a slight abuse of terms, be called "quietness" in architectural style and decoration, are the chief features. What between the great breadth of the roadways, and the unwillingness of the Japanese to allow their earthquake-

shaken houses more than one story over the ground-floor, nor always that, the extent of a city which even now, however shrunken from its old grandeur, numbers a quarter of a million of inhabitants, is sufficiently great; and we have at least two miles of street to traverse before we reach our first destination, the Mikado's Palace. The centre of the town is almost exclusively devoted to shops, warehouses, tea-houses, inns, and the like; public buildings and institutions, together with the private houses of the nobility and the upper classes, are more frequent in the outer quarters; while most of the temples, Shinto or Buddhist, famed as the chiefest adornment of Kioto, are placed on the outskirts of the houses, beside the many tree-margined embranchments of the swift Kamo-Gawa, or on the green slopes of the hills that encircle this loveliest of plains.

Familiar by hearsay, or by the specimens which may now be seen in abundance everywhere, with Japanese art, and aware that Kioto is pre-eminently the artistic city of Japan, the visitor cannot but wonder, as he traverses the business quarters of the mid-town, at the want of display of any kind. In size and style one shop-front much resembles another, and except the quaint Japanese or occasionally Chinese characters fantastically inscribed on the lintel or door-posts, there is little to proclaim the nature of the wares within. These treasures, embroidery, porcelain, lacquer-work, enamel, metal-lurgy, painting, than which none choicer are to be found throughout the island Empire, are stowed away for the most part in the unostentatious background of small apartments. Coleridge's devil "did grin" when he passed a genteel cottage, knowing its apparent humility to be merely the aping of pride. But then the devil was in Scotland; had his morning walk been through Kioto his grin would have missed its meaning; for vain as the Japanese may be, with or without cause needs not to discuss at present, of his nationality—no man in the world is freer from individual vanity, none more averse from showing off and pretentiousness, which indeed he would look upon as that worst of all offences stigmatised by the Japanese code, a breach of good manners. To say that the snob is wholly absent from among the social fauna of Japan would be perhaps, human nature considered, an over-bold assertion, but certainly the specimens of that kind are very rare.

Issuing at last from these the most crowded and busiest quarters of the town, from the almost democratic equality of shops and houses, tea-rooms, bath-rooms, refreshment-rooms, and the rest, we enter on a quieter region, interspersed with gardens, the entrance-gates of private residences, or public offices, till we come on a long, low whitewashed wall of brick and plaster, topped by a plain tile coping, one side of a parallelogram which encloses in its circuit a space of

about thirty acres. Within these walls, on this spot of enclosed ground, dwelt for one thousand and seventy-five years of uninterrupted succession, the Mikado, Emperor of Japan, direct descendant of the Sun goddess, high priest, or rather himself the ever-present pattern and deity of Shinto, absolute lord and ruler, unquestioning obedience to whose every will is the first duty of every one, male or female, high or low, great or small, of the three-and-thirty million inhabitants of Japan. What evidences of despotic power, what caprices of despotic fancy, what traces of despotic cruelty, what treasures of despotic greed, what extravagances of despotic luxury may we not expect to find within these walls?

Leaving our vehicles at the unadorned outer gate, but accompanied by the men who have been dragging them, we give our names as visitors to the writer or clerk at the old porter's lodge, where not a soldier, not a policeman even keeps guard, and enter the spacious courtyard, where full in front stands the palace. And what do we see? A one-storied assemblage of small apartments, exactly similar to those of any ordinary Japanese dwelling, only somewhat more extensive, united by long, low, open corridors, the walls composed of unpainted timber, with the usual sliding screens of paper and bamboo for doors and windows, the pillars plain, unadorned, unpainted though polished timber; the projecting roof, part tile, part thatch. Within we walk over simple wooden floors of pine, laid down with the identical close-woven mats, scrupulously clean like everything else, but otherwise neither better nor worse than those of a private house; the ceiling above is plain as the rest, and as neat. One, and one only, apartment is there to betoken state; a kind of public hall, or rather open shed, on smooth wood pillars, over-roofed with wood; a simple raised seat with the portraits of the Emperor and Empress above indicates that the place does duty for an audience-hall. The sliding screens which separate the hall from the passage behind are figured with the supposed portraits of Chinese sages; the front is open to a garden walk. Neither here, nor anywhere else throughout the palace, is any ornament displayed except it be the paintings, many of them by the best Japanese artists, and representing chiefly landscape scenes, birds, flowers, studies of trees, and the like, which diversify the wall-slides between one room and another; nor mats excepted, have the little closet-like rooms themselves any furniture or decoration beyond an occasional piece of quaint bronze-work, or some carved utensil for tea-making or food. A small, ungilt, unpainted, imageless Shinto shrine denotes the Mikado's personal form of worship; while within a closet, shut off by heavy lacquered screens from the adjoining apartment, is said to be the original stone of sovereignty, round and polished, bestowed by the Sun goddess Ama-terasu on her descendants, together with a copy of the sword,

conjoint symbol of rule, and also divinely given ; the sword itself is preserved at the still more ancient shrine of the mythical Yamato-dake, queller of the barbarous aborigines of Eastern Japan. Nor is the heaven-sent mirror, chief emblem of the Mikado's great ancestress, within these walls, but at the sacred temple in the adjoining province of Tse ; the Mikado contenting himself with a copy, now deposited in the little Shinto shrine mentioned before. But to none of these objects, nor even to the private apartments and sleeping room of the Mikado himself, is the approach in any way guarded other than by the customary sliding screens ; no preparation for defence, indeed no possibility of it exists anywhere within the palace, not even privacy sufficient to ordinary European requirements ; no vestige of luxury, none even of any but the most moderate expenditure, but simplicity everywhere ; such is the Imperial abode. The very garden amid which it stands, though laid out with the best of that horticultural art in which Japan has no rival, is equally unpretentious, quiet, almost homely ; no wide walks, no stately avenues, no giant fountains, no statues, no arches, no balustraded terraces, no calculated approaches, no regal vistas ; such a garden as might be the recreation ground of a well-to-do gentleman, or quiet-loving author or poet ; barely a Twickenham, much less a Pembroke Lodge ; in nothing a Belvedere or a Versailles.

And these are the head-quarters of the most ancient dynasty that yet lives and reigns on earth's surface amid the ruins of so many sceptres, so many thrones ; this is the palace, this the residence of the most absolute autocrat who ever claimed not merely the "right divine of kings to govern wrong," but almost divinity itself ; this the dwelling, the shrine of the goddess-descended demi-god, the heir of the war spirit Jimmo-Tenno, of the civiliser and organizer Sujin, of the heroic Jingu-Kojo, victress of Corea, of the heaven-ascended Yamato-Daké, of the people's father Nintoku-Tenno, of three thousand years of worshipped sovereignty ; this building, not distinguished in type, scarce distinguished in size and details from a private house ; these quiet groves, this unguarded enclosure ! And rightly is it thus. Here, as in the sacred mirror itself, we see the inmost nature of the Mikado's sway, the true position of the sun-born Emperor amid his kindred people. Secure in his own congenital and inherent right, raised above all around him by dignity of nature and birth, a demi-god among men, he owns no need of the two props that most uphold the tottering weakness of artificial rulers, the iron and the gold, military strength and pompous display. Such accessories would not set off, they could only obscure the purity of his glory, as clouds the sun ; more yet, the living head of a religion that teaches by existent fact, not by written precept, of a system according to which man is a law to himself, and nature's own simplicity the

standard measure of the highest great and good, he is in his own self the embodiment, the supreme illustration, the perfection of that simplicity, of that law, he the archetypal fact of Shinto, the personification of the god-governed Empire. And such, as no uncertain history tells, were the Emperors of Japan for nigh two thousand years, till the "thick, sweet, stupefying incense smoke" of a corrupt Buddhism, and the fatal caste-avatar of Southern Asia, overshadowed the clear heavens of Shinto. Let the foremost living Japanese scholar, the most accurate critic, Ernest Satow, tell the tale,—it is one among many such,—of Nintoku-Tenno, Mikado in the third century, contemporary of the European despot Constantine, the Asiatic tyrant Sapor. "The Mikado, having climbed a hill, looked all around, and observing the absence of smoke from the cottages of the people, decreed that for the space of three years no taxes or forced labour should be imposed on his subjects. His own palace, for want of funds to repair it, was allowed to become so dilapidated that the roof admitted the rain. Three years later he again ascended the hill, and beheld smoke arising from every dwelling. The people were now rich enough to bear taxation without feeling the burden, and voluntarily offered to contribute towards the rebuilding of the palace." Legendary in form the story may be, but it is history in fact; nor unaptly illustrated by him who so lately on the removal of the seat of Empire from Kioto to Tokio, refused to have a palace of his own erected to him in his new capital, till such time as the finances of the Empire might be able easily and without prejudice to other national interests to bear the outlay. May that time soon come! Meantime the Emperor, inheritor and restorer of the secular throne, Mutsu-Hito, true Mikado, and worthy descendant of worthy ancestors, inhabits not a palace but a private dwelling, not the less honoured, but more, for his faithful adherence to the principles of Shinto and Japan.

To these very principles, as the learned Japanese scholar Motoori, the most authentic exponent of Shinto in the last century, informs us, was due the ready access and the familiarity of daily intercourse allowed by the Mikados in their earlier and better days to their subjects at large, when the Japanese Emperors were not only among their people but of them, their leaders and fellow-soldiers in war, their instructors and fellow-workmen in the arts of peace; hence the absence of all vain parade, all idle pomp, splendour, and luxury in their personal and immediate surroundings; they exemplified in themselves the simple conformity to nature in which consists the highest Japanese perfection; 'fitting models, rulers, high priests, gods of the nation to which they belonged, and of which they were the head by right, alike natural and divine, the existent unchallenged fact of birth.

Nor less truly with the unerring instinct of genius does Motoori ascribe the eclipse, and, for nigh ten centuries, the practical obliteration of the Mikado's rule, to the violation of these very prescriptions of Shinto, to their supersession by Asiatic court ceremony and cumbrous pomp, to luxury and artificialism, to seclusion, partly voluntary, partly enforced, and separation from the people; in a word to the Chino-Buddhist system and caste-government that for an entire millennium brooded, as clouds do over a cholera-stricken land, over the length and breadth of Japan. And the first remedy that his writing as he did in the very worst days of the Toku-gawa usurpation, when the compulsory immurement of the true Sovereign had become so absolute that his very existence was, to many of his own subjects, a matter of doubt, can suggest for the many evils of his time, is to urge that the Mikado should once more re-appear, a Japanese among Japanese, in personal and daily contact with his subjects, living amidst them and after their fashion, as in the times of old.

Nothing could have been further to all appearance from realisation than this advice, wise and well-grounded as it was, when given in the days of the too-powerful Bakufu and the family of Kii. But in Japan, as elsewhere, the whirligig of time brought its revenges; and the story of 1868 and the succeeding years has amply proved and illustrated the soundness of Motoori's counsel. There in the Palace of Kioto itself, though no longer honoured by the actual presence of Japanese majesty, I see a curious exemplification of the recent change, or rather of reversion to the ancient and normal condition of things in the numerous groups of Japanese, most of them, as their dress indicates, belonging to the middle, not a few to the lower classes, whom I meet strolling about in respectful curiosity through the rooms and corridors of the Imperial dwelling. The entrance of the Mikado's historical palace, whence the jealous tyranny of the Shoguns so long excluded all visits, except their own, is now practically open to all the Mikado's subjects alike, whatever their condition, and the eagerness with which they avail themselves of the permission bears witness no less than their orderly and subdued demeanour to the loyalty of their devotion. Well grounded in national self-respect, there is no fear lest a Japanese crowd, though made up of roughs and street-arabs, or rather of those who by prescription would be such, were they natives of Western Europe or the United States, should for a moment forget in word, deed, or even gesture, what is due to the nation and the nation's sovereign, lest "princely privilege" should be compromised by "vile participation," or familiarity lapse into contempt. How far the same may hold good where others than Japanese are concerned might not be so easy to determine; and I myself personally incline to think

that the extreme limit of condescension has been already reached, if not overpassed in that direction. European race-stands, circus performances, the decks of foreign frigates, and the like are, to say the least, questionable places for the presence of the Mikado of Dai-Nihon, the heir of Jimmo-Tenno, the descendant of Ama-terasu, goddess of the sun. Among his own kinsman-subjects the case is widely different, the precedent honourable and safe.

Such is the writing and such the reading of it on the walls of the Kioto Palace. But the more fully to apprehend its meaning, let us pay a brief visit to the favourite recreation grounds of the Japanese Emperor without the city circuit. So, turning to the right, we cross the pebbly bed of the Kamo-gawa where it flows not far from the palace limits, and traverse a level half mile or more of gardens, fields, and little peasant cottages, till at the base of the pine-clad hills that border to the east the plain of Kioto, we reach a very unpretentious garden wall and an unornamented gate. Here we give in our names to the old door-keeper, and without further preliminary are admitted—as indeed is any person of respectable appearance, and some, if European toilette ideas be taken as standard, of very disrespecktable—to the pleasure-grounds of Shu-gaku, the resort by preference of the later Mikados when tired, as they often must have been, of their half-seclusion, half-imprisonment in their city abode. Terrace above terrace the grassy slopes run up the hill-side, traversed by narrow serpentine walks, and dotted here and there by little thatched garden houses, wood and bamboo, where the Mikado and his attendants might take tea, and enjoy the different points of view across this Japanese Val d'Arno with its Eastern Florence lighted up, tower and temple, castle and palace, by the morning sun. Cherry-trees and maples, the former delighting the Japanese eye by the delicate tints of their abundant flowers in the spring-time (when, indeed, it was my good fortune to visit Shu-gaku), the latter by the gorgeous crimson of the unfolding leaves, are thick planted everywhere, but mostly in avenues by the winding margin of an artificial lake, where miniature bridges and rock-work islands give somewhat of a Chinese character to the scene. On the highest ledge of the garden grounds a wooden pavilion, plain and unadorned like the other constructions here, has been skilfully placed so as to command through an opening between the giant pine trunks a complete bird's-eye view of the city and plain of Kioto, girt in with its wooded amphitheatre of hills, except where it opens southward far away to the level lands of Osaka and the distant sea-coast. The day is fine, an Italian spring morning, and holidaymakers, shopmen apparently, artisans, day-labourers, and country-folk are strolling about at leisure through the imperial enclosures, admiring the

flowers, gazing on the lovely prospect, or grouped by the water's edge feeding certain huge golden carp, favoured pets of the Japanese populace, with rice pellets purchased at a booth close by. Others are respectfully bowing their heads before an imageless shrine bosomed among the shrubs, and commemorative of some Japanese demi-god of the Mikado's family. Gardens, walks, ponds, temples, pavilions, all are such for size and style as might be owned by any quiet-loving gentleman-proprietor of orderly habits and good taste; anything less royal, less imperial, in the vulgar Asiatic or, only too frequently, European sense of the word, it would be difficult to imagine. The recreation grounds of the "people's Emperor," for such the Mikado truly is, are as characteristically simple, as devoid of adventitious parade and circumstance, as are the official head-quarters, the palace itself.

But if content to pass the days of his mortal sojourn after this homely and, to use the stereotyped phrase, patriarchal fashion, the Shinto demi-god will surely at least, when departing to take his place among his deified ancestors, the tutelary Powers of Japan, leave to earth as memorial of his reign some gorgeous monument, some star-pointing pyramid, some pillared mausoleum, some giant wonder of labour and art in long-enduring witness of his greatness and virtues. Lesser rulers by far than the Mikado of Japan do and have done so; and here in Dai-Nihon itself the tombs of the Shoguns, mere military chiefs of usurped authority, and they themselves not sovereigns, but subjects by title, have made famous the burial-grounds of Nikko, of Shiba, and Nyeno with some of the choicest, if not, indeed, the very choicest marvels of architecture and skill. Not so the lords of the Shoguns. At the town of Nara, capital of the Yamato province, about thirty miles to the south of Kioto, and in its vicinity, is the favourite resting-place of the Emperors; let us visit them there. Unfrequented by the sight-seeing tourist, some of them, indeed, almost unknown to his research, their graves are for the most part amid the fields, under the forest trees of the wide land; but of one, the great ruler, Kai-kwa Tonuo, fourth of the sun-descended line, and numbered among the demi-gods more than two thousand years ago, the tomb is yet to be seen just outside the town gates of Nara; and now, leaving the street lines behind us, we stand before it. An uncarved gateway of smooth, unpainted timber, a small gravel-strewn space, wherein to offer up commemorative prayer, two tall lanterns of hewn but ungraven stone on either side, and beyond these a little earth-mound, thickly planted round with bamboo for screen, and on its summit a lofty pine-tree, overshadowing a single upright cube of uncarved, uninscribed, unornamented stone; no other memorial is there, no other needed. *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*; the heaven and the earth of Japan are the monument of the Mikado.

We have seen Shinto in its imperial and political, let us now see it in its more strictly religious aspect ; and from among the many shrines of Kioto let us select for our purpose that of "Inari no Yashiro," on the eastern hill slopes that adjoin the town. "This popular Shinto temple," as we are informed by Mr. E. Satow in his excellent handbook, "the prototype of the thousand of Inari temples scattered all over the country, was founded in A.D. 711, when the Goddess of Food is said to have first manifested herself on the hill behind. The first temple consisted of three small chapels on the three peaks of the hill, whence the worship of the goddess and her companion deities was removed to its present site in 1246." These two associated deities are, by Mr. Satow's account, Ōmiyanome, a personification of the Mikado's palace, and another courtly god who met Ninigi no mikoto, the grandson of the Sun goddess, when descending from heaven with the emblematic regalia, the mirror, the sword, and the stone, to inaugurate the imperial dynasty at Japan. To this divine trio, the Harvest god, who here revealed himself in the locally appropriate form of a crane carrying a grain of rice in his bill, and another deity, Ōyashima no kami by name, in whom all the islands of Japan are collectively personified, have for five hundred years past been added. The existing structure, a wooden one, like all Shinto and most Buddhist temples in Japan, is about sixty years old ; for except where fortresses are concerned, stone is rarely used as constructive material in this earthquake-shaken country. Such is the history in brief of Inari no Yashiro, or the "Temple of the Rice-bearer," whither, returning townwards from the Imperial Gardens, we now direct our way.

Running as though their very lives depended on it, and exchanging words of banter with each other and with those they meet on the road, our "jin-riki-sha" men have cleared the long wooden bridge across the straggling river-bed, and traversed about two miles of suburb ; the streets are not less broad and straight than those in the town itself, but the houses are lower and poorer-looking, the shops, among which I remark an extraordinary proportion of toy-stalls, indicating the neighbourhood of a temple (for to purchase something wherewithal to amuse his children, seems to be an essential part of every Japanese father's piety), are small, and the people who throng the way poorly clad,—many indeed, after the hardy Japanese fashion that so vividly recalls memories of old Greece, are nearly naked. Yet for all this there is no dirt, no squalor, no gloom, no hint of discomfort or discontent. At last we arrive opposite to a tree-flanked opening between the shops on the left-hand side of the road, and a wide path spanned by a colossal "torii" leading upward to the temple grounds beyond.

A "torii" is a structure composed of a large cylindrical cross-

beam, placed athwart two rounded wooden pillars slightly inclined inwards, with its ends projecting beyond them; a similar but smaller piece of wood, parallel with the upper one, unites the side-posts not far below the top cross-work. Originally these "torii" were always uncarved, though carefully smoothed, unpainted, and without any metal joinings; but in later times, when the simplicity of Shinto had been corrupted by Chino-Buddhist innovation, they were frequently made of stone, and even of brass; their dimensions vary from those of an ordinary gateway for foot-passengers to thirty feet in height, with proportional width. No Shinto temple is without one, and they have often many "torii" in front; their purpose being, it is said, but whether rightly I know not, to serve as perches for the birds which tenant the sacred enclosure; for myself I never once saw a bird of any description, not even a crow, make such use of them. Groups of little "torii," painted red, are often to be found arranged consecutively in avenues leading up to some retired Shinto shrine among the trees; indeed an idea of sacredness seems to attach itself to the form, though rather as a matter of sentiment than precisely of worship.

Leaving our "jin-riki-shas" outside, we pass on foot under the entrance "torii," and walk up a gently sloping pathway, broad and clean swept, among the magnificent Japanese pines—"cryptomeria" the learned call them—that are invariably planted round every Shinto shrine, be it small or great. Soon we reach the foot of a lofty flight of stone steps, also well kept and clean swept; at the top of these a second "torii" admits us in due course on to a grand plateau, where we are fronted by a spacious raised wooden shed, open on all sides, roofed with thatch—your only Shinto wear for roofage—and adorned, if adornment it can be called, by a bulky straw rope wound about the pillars, and by notched slips of white paper, pendent and fluttering from the eaves. There on high days and holidays is held the "Kagura" dance, an ancient choragic performance, executed by two or more virgins, who, crowned with flowers and waving paper-festooned wands in their hands, like modest (if the adjective be not incongruous) columbines in a ballet, move in slow time along the stage, or weave mazy measures around each other in mystic convolutions; how far, with reference to planetary cycles and epicycles, the investigators of myths, solar or stellar, may decide. Enough for the present that the dance is alike decorous and pretty. Beyond this shed are two temples, each dedicated to the same quinary of deities; the foremost one, on a level with the "Kagura" stage, being the less characteristic, we will pass it by in favour of the other shrine, placed rather higher up, and which shall be described in due course. On either side of the temple front are two stone foxes, the special emblems of the "Inari," seated aloft

each on a high pedestal, sacred but unworshipped symbols, peculiar to the presiding deity of the place. More ordinary guardians of the shrine are two great stone dogs, of fanciful and rather leonine cut; in strict Shinto practice these, like everything else belonging to the temple, should be unpainted; in the instances before us, however, the license of blue and green colouring has been admitted. One of these Lombardic-looking monsters, which does duty for a male, has its mouth open, the other, supposed to be a female, has hers close shut; a manifest anomaly, and intended, I suppose, to indicate what should be, rather than what is, in the ordinary course of nature. An ex-voto shed, and another wherein are kept certain sacred cars used in yearly processions, flank the temple. All about, sometimes ranged in lines plantation-like, sometimes grouped in clusters, stand innumerable stone lamps, offerings of the devout, each raised on a neat stone pillar varying from five to eight or ten feet in height; the four-sided opening of the lantern is occasionally fashioned into a circle on the one side and a crescent on the other, doubtless to denote the sun and the moon; I have also observed, but much more rarely, a star-like aperture. It may be worth notice, because a characteristic circumstance, that Shinto, as befits a system concerned exclusively with the powers and influence that act on the human, and more particularly the Japanese race, takes but little account of the stars, probably because too distant for its cognisance. Outside the temple, but close to it, are a few thatched sheds. In one of them sits a priest in ordinary secular dress; near him are several neat little piles of very inartistic views of the place, where everything is explained, at good need, by Japanese superscriptions written all about the sketch, which is printed on the thinnest of paper, and a heap of tiny scrolls, whereon the names of the temple and of the guardian deity are inscribed; these he sells for a microscopic sum to whoever wills, as remembrances of the place, and at the same time as titles to a continuance of the divine favour. For Japanese devotion, not in Shinto merely, but under whatever other form it may assume, is nothing if not local. In another shed refreshments, mostly sweets, are to be purchased, and more quaint ex-voto pictures, contemptuous of perspective and commemorative of wondrous deliverances from sickness or danger, are hung up; but within the temple nothing of all this is permitted.

What, then, does the shrine itself contain? What is it that these crowds of worshippers, many of them pilgrims from a considerable distance, have come to visit? Strictly, nay literally, the Invisible. We have mounted a few more stone steps, and are now before the sanctuary of the Fivo. It is a small wooden, thatch-covered building; the floor within is raised, and fully open to view, but its actual access is barred by a low railing and gate in front of the inner flight of

stairs. Once a year, or more often if circumstances demand, this gate is opened to all. Shreds of white paper in alternate notches and wisps of clean straw fringe the eaves; a straw rope, so placed as when shaken to sound a gong, hangs down from the lintel over the entrance. The apartment—for it has no other appearance—within is laid down with the customary spotless white matting of a Japanese interior; two or three small square cushions lie about for the priests to sit on during service-time; two or three wooden wands—"gohoi" is their proper designation—bearing at one extremity pendants of notched paper, commonly white, but sometimes distinguished with green, blue, yellow, and red, are placed on the floor close by; on one side a small gong is suspended in a lacquered framework. At the farther end of the room stands a kind of altar, or cupboard rather, plain unpainted wood like the rest; and on this are sometimes, but by no means invariably, placed two small sprigs of the "Sakaki" tree, a kind of cypress, known, I believe, to botanists by the name of "Cleyera Japonica," and held appropriate to divine worship as a symbol of purity; the tree itself is somewhat rare, and thence it may be esteemed the more. Between these, on a simple wooden stand, is often to be seen a circular metal mirror, of a foot or more in diameter, an important, indeed the most important, emblem of Shinto, but the exact significance of which is matter of controversy; the back of the mirror is not rarely covered by a map, in metal relief, of some one or other Japanese province. Such a mirror is, I am told, kept in every Shinto temple, but is by no means always exposed to view. Two, three, or more "gohoi" wands are also laid on the shelf at the top. Within the hollow of the altar-cupboard—which is, however, at no time opened to the public, very rarely even to sacerdotal inspection—are the objects, whatever they may be, in which the sacredness of the entire place is supposed to be incorporated and centred. But as none but the priests, nor they even except on the most solemn occasions, ever so much as pretend to see them, their nature, not to say their very existence, is uncertain; nor, according to pure and unadulterated Shinto theory, is it by any means essential to worship. This is all; and the holiest Shinto shrine in all Japan, those of Tse itself not excepted, has nothing more to show.

Nor are the rites of Shinto worship less unpretentious than the temples where they are celebrated. One, two, or three priests in long white or slightly flowered robes, with square black biretta-like caps of thin gauze on their heads, each morning take their place on the cushions in front of the altar; and there, wand in hand, recite a few formulas of prayer, accompanied by an occasional note of the gong, after which they worship, bowing their heads, and disrobe themselves. Sometimes, though not often, a "Kagura" dance is performed, the priests taking on themselves the musical accompani-

ment, if "musical" be not a misnomer where a European ear could detect nothing in the least worthy of that adjective. Meanwhile the laity stand outside the paling; each man having first performed the slight ablutions required by the ritual, rubs his hands together—an act of respect due to a superior presence—bows his head, strikes with the knotted straw rope twice or thrice on the gong suspended above, casts some trifling offering into a large open chest before the temple entrance, and puts up, most often in silence, a short extempore prayer for whatever may happen to be the object of his desires; after which, bowing again, he steps aside to purchase a written amulet-paper, such as I have described already; or loiters awhile beneath the shade of the sacred grove, as though to bring himself more completely under the guardian influence of the local deity; or, if so disposed, retires from the precincts altogether. Nor, even if he should be, as often happens, a pilgrim from the farthest corner of Japan, and have measured many hundred miles from his home to the shrine, is any other act or form of devotion incumbent on him, nor does he, secure in the efficacy of his once proffered petition, twice repeat the rite. Whatever may be true of other heathens (or Christians either for the nonce), these certainly do not think to be heard by their much speaking.

We, too, will now quit the principal shrine, and stroll at leisure among the many lesser temples jotted over the sacred enclosure, which extends for about half a mile square in every direction from the road-level up to the mountain-tops, a thousand feet high or thereabouts, overlooking the plain of Kioto. Footpaths, ingeniously and solidly constructed, and kept with a neatness that might do honour to an English gentleman's park, wind to right and left among the trees, connecting with each other the various spots which popular tradition delights to point out, and popular devotion to honour. Of these the most ancient are the three chapels already mentioned on the hill summit; but many others, of great though not equal antiquity, have perched themselves on the steep slopes, some shyly embosomed in narrow dells by the side of cool fountains, while others have taken up more conspicuous positions, whence through tree and shrub they overlook the plain and the river; but no one without its own peculiar beauty of site. On all sides violets stud the tufted grass, great azalea clusters of scented pink burn like stray bonfires among the jutting rocks; far in heaven overhead arches the enlaced canopy of twisted pine branches; little rivulets, crystal pure, come tumbling down from the heights; and cool breezes, light and life-giving as those of the Tuscan Apennines, rustle through the wood, and temper the heat of sunny May, else almost excessive in this southerly clime. Sometimes, according as the fancy of Inari's worshippers may have willed it so, we pass under whole avenues of red-painted wooden "torii,"

thick placed side by side ; then, turning a path corner, we suddenly find ourselves in presence of a neatly kept oratory, with a priest in his little hut on guard close by. After many windings among the ravines, and meeting or passing many a merry band of laughing pilgrims—for the Japanese look on a visit to their gods much as they would on one to their yet flesh-invested friends, and are equally of a mind for fun in either case—we stand on a commanding height by the shrine of Kami no Jinga, “the Oku no In or Holy of Holies,” says Mr. Satow, “where a huge boulder marks the spot where the goddess made her first appearance in the year 711.” The boulder itself, a mass of volcanic tufa, forms the apex of the hill ; it is protected by a neat stone paling, and further honoured by a straw rope wound about it, and a liberal allowance of notched paper streamers, all white ; while the special personality of the goddess who first selected it is announced by two stone foxes keeping guard on either side of the smooth wooden “torii” at the entrance. Two stone lanterns also flank the shrine, and a white banner flutters over it and guides visitors to the spot. Close by a bamboo framework, shaped like a screen, and divided by several cross-lines, bears suspended from it long rows of paper tickets, each inscribed with the name of a worshipper ; memoranda left with the deity to keep the petitions offered fresh in her mind. Besides this, which may appropriately be called the visiting-book of the goddess, an infinity of thin wooden slips, pointed at the lower end, are stuck into the ground near the shrine, alongside the path leading to it, and indeed everywhere all over the hillside, with shreds of writing attached to them, denoting the names of the deity whose good-will has been sought, and of the petitioner himself ; their frequency combines, with the extreme neatness of the grounds, to give the entire enclosure somewhat of the appearance of a carefully-kept botanical garden on a large scale, with the names of the plants on tickets. How many anxious petitions are here recorded, how many answered, what a tale of fears and hopes, of desires, of sorrows, of expectation, of disappointment, of gratitude, of life, of death, is registered here !

Many, far too many, writers about Japan, either from want of observation, or incapability to understand what they observed, have repeated parrot-like one after another the phrase, that “Shinto has no hold on the Japanese mind.” So far as I can judge, the crowds that daily worship at these temples, the countless petitions offered up there, the numerous monthly or yearly recurring pilgrimages, the local memorials purchased and treasured up in almost every house of Japan, appear to tell a very different tale. “But the Japanese do not look as if they took their religion in earnest,” says some Western traveller, as he or she, standing by, watches with half-amused contempt the men and women of the land approach the open shrine

amid talk and laughter, and after one or two inclinations of the head, rubbings of the hands, and a composed silence of a couple of minutes at the most, turn away to resume their scarce interrupted conversation and jest, with no trace of seriousness in manner or countenance to indicate where they have been or what they have done. Can, then, a religion exert much influence over its followers, that claims of them no more outward observance than this?

Precisely so, and in that very meagreness of outward ritual and observance is found the best proof that Shinto is even now as of old a living power in Japan. Where a belief is so thoroughly incorporated into the nature of those who hold it as to be identified with it, but little is needed of set gesture or countenance, of studied preparation or prolonged rite. All these things are, rightly understood, mere appliances for the make-believe, or at best "with much pain attain to half-believe," of those to whose inner heart the belief is external; the props and adjuncts of a confessedly feeble faith; the artificial appliances to bring about that which of itself would not be. This test, applicable in its measure to every creed, is to none more applicable than to Shinto, which, it should be borne in mind, is in its ultimate expression nothing but the worship of existent nature, and is then best exemplified when nature herself at her best is best expressed. Simple ideas require but simple symbols; that which is natural asks not much help from the artificial; plain wood, white paper, straw bands, these and their like are enough where the creed is not so much written on the heart as it is the heart itself. Few and simple indeed were the symbols of Christianity in the days of its strength; the birth and growth of Christian decoration and art has kept steady pace with the decline of Christian belief as a living power among Western nations. Nor does the history of Islam, though in a field widely apart, teach a different lesson.

For the results of Shinto we need only look on Japan herself; and on the wonderfully high degree of true civilisation, that is of honour, of courage, of social self-respect, of regard for others, of reverence for authority, age, and learning, of delicate artistic sense and practice, of subordination, of organized government, of courtesy, of cleanliness, of industry, that she has developed for herself and out of herself; look also on the ready flexibility with which she takes up from other nations whatever may profit her, not crudely, not unintelligently, but modifying, altering, improving, to suit her own circumstances and requirements. And this civilisation of her own, not indeed the civilisation of railroads and machines, nor that of speculators and stock-exchanges, nor that even of capitalists and paupers, of luxurious ostentation at one end of the scale, and brutalising degradation at the other, but the civilisation of mind and morals, of art and beauty, of industry and content, of subordination and labour, of

mutual kindliness, forbearance and help, with its results many and great ones, *pace* even Sir Harry Parkes, she owes in all essentials not to China and Buddhism, not to Europe or America, not to Christianity or materialism, but to herself and Shinto. True that to her innate capacity for developing that very civilisation, to the qualities that rendered her by birthright what she is, she owes Shinto itself; its aspects, political and religious, are but the outcomings of the Japanese nature, the spontaneous growth of the soil. Japanese nationality and Shinto are in truth one thing—nay, the latter is to all intents the summed-up expression, the concentrated essence of the former, living with its life, decaying with its decay, not to be divided from it but by death, the death of both. Born together, they will perish, if perish they must, together; the death-note as the birth-note of Shinto and Japan is one.

To the still stranger assertion that “Shinto has been completely superseded by Buddhism,” the one hundred and twenty-eight thousand one hundred and twenty-three Shinto temples and shrines, in none of which Buddhism has the least art or part, scattered broadcast over Japan, together with what has been described, and can any day be verified by the most ordinary observation, of the popularity, nay, almost universality of the modes of worship connected with those shrines, may well be considered a sufficient and conclusive reply. Buddhist temples, many of them magnificent in size, and gorgeous in decoration, and Buddhist priests with holy vows and shaven heads, do indeed abound in the land, but Shinto is so far from being superseded by them, that it gives many signs of probably superseding them itself in great measure before long. That Buddhism has in past times partly corrupted, partly by an assumed and deceptive likeness, supplanted Shinto in Japanese practice, that it has largely contributed to the introduction of a caste-system, of priestcraft, of superstition, with the mental and moral deterioration consequent on these things, and more especially among the foolish-minded and unwise of the upper and ruling classes in days gone by, is unhappily true; nor less so that even now it continues to exert, though with diminished power, and on a more restricted scale, the same injurious influence that it exerted in the days of Kobo Daishi, Nichiren, and the other great leaders of bigotry and fanaticism in their day. This too is, however, a daily lessening harm. Nor has the wrong wrought to Japan by Chino-Buddhism been without some compensating advantages, greater certainly than could be looked for from the inweaving of any other foreign strand into the national texture.

W. GIFFORD PALGRAVE.

THRIFTLESS THRIFT.

MR. FAWCETT'S short pamphlet on *Aids to Thrift now offered by the Post Office*—issued early in this year and to be had at any post office free of charge—in drawing the attention of the industrial classes to the agencies opened to them by the Government for the investment of savings, describes one which, on account of imperfect legislation, disappoints the desire it is intended to encourage.

In chapter iv. the Postmaster-General shows "How Lives can be Insured." But the minimum sum that can be insured for is £20, and the experience of the seventeen years since the Act passed establishing this system of insurance through the Post Office has conclusively proved that the amount of contribution required for insuring this sum and the method of paying it deter the labouring classes from accepting the offer; the more so as it is also far above their wants.

In 1868, four years after the Act had been in operation, the late Lord Lichfield brought in a Bill to amend it, especially as to the assuring of payment of money on death, and proposed, "that the enactment that no contract with the Government for payment on the death of any one person should be of less amount than £20 should be repealed." That portion of the Bill was strongly opposed on behalf of Insurance Companies and other bodies whose interests were supposed to be at stake, and it was not carried.

Six years afterwards, namely in 1874, the Commissioners on Friendly Societies revived that question, and urged very strongly in their Fourth Report (§§ 851, 852) that "the system of insurance through the Post Office be amended, so as to reach more completely the wants of the labouring classes." They state that the regulation that a man cannot insure his life at the Post Office for any sum below £20 "excludes at once the large class of persons who do not want to provide an inheritance for their children, but who do want to provide against becoming a burden on them at death, and against the risk of being buried as paupers." They add that, "This is the class which now insures in the Burial Societies, subject to all the disadvantages and the risks to which the members of these societies are exposed." Mr. Scudamore, then, at the head of the Savings Bank Department of the Post Office, informed the Commissioners that the poor did not use the Government system. From the time that the Act took effect in 1865 up to the close of 1872, the Government had issued only 3,885 life policies for a total sum of £293,467, giving an average of £76 per policy, "showing very plainly that the trifling results produced by the Act, such as they

are, have been produced at the top and not at the bottom of the scale." And this remains true to the present day. The Report of the Postmaster-General for 1879, published 14th August, 1880, showed that the number of policies had only increased to 5,740, and the sum insured to £451,930, giving the average of nearly £80 per policy. The report for 1880 shows the number of life policies to be 6,224, the sum insured to be £491,930 and the average per policy a fraction less than £80. "Mr. Scudamore," the Commissioners remark, "would allow insurance to be effected to as low a sum as £5, which would generally meet the demand of those who join the Burial Societies."

Notwithstanding the efforts of Lord Lichfield and the subsequent recommendation of the Friendly Societies Commission, this subject was not included in the Act of 1875, which consolidated and amended the law relating to friendly and other societies; and it still remains in abeyance.

No attempt, I believe, has been made to dispute the fact that it would be an essential service to the industrial classes to reduce the minimum sum that could be insured for at death to £5. If interested bodies still stand in the way, it is time that the grounds of their resistance should be reconsidered. These bodies are principally the Burial Societies and Burial Companies; and there are few chapters in our social history more curious than the one describing these great societies which pervade the country, numbering their members by millions of the wage-earning classes, and having the disposal of a vast amount of capital, of which a large portion is wasted, to the great loss and disappointment of the contributors.

The story is told in the Fourth Report of the Commissioners on Friendly Societies (1874), and has been continued to the present time in the Annual Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies. The revelation of the enormous amount of abuses described by the Commissioners led to some corrective legislation in 1875, but, as I have briefly noticed in the number of the *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1880, more is wanted; and to this end it is necessary that the whole subject should again be brought prominently before the public.

The strong and very general instinct of the humbler classes to provide against what they deem the disgrace of a pauper's funeral, and their desire also to prevent the cost of their burial from falling upon their relatives, gave rise to these societies. They appear to have originated in Lancashire and Yorkshire in the early days of the modern manufacturing system, and to have grown with its growth. Their primitive form was that of a number of artisans who lived in the same neighbourhood agreeing to a levy of a shilling on the death of one of themselves, and "sending round the hat" to collect it.

The collector was also one of themselves, and the management was usually prudent and inexpensive. But in such societies, as the elder members begin to drop off, the levy increases to two, three, or more shillings; in less than a generation the club comes to an end; and there is scarcely a town or large village, at least in the south and west of England, that has not its tale to relate of frustrated hopes, and the contribution of years thrown away.

The frequent failure of these primitive clubs called into activity another organization, that of *Local Collecting Burial Societies*, having "an elaborate system of paid collectors, and paid office-holders"—president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary, and committee-men—with the natural result, in a large proportion of cases, of expensive management. These societies are chiefly found in Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Cheshire. They numbered in 1874, according to the estimate of the Commissioners, about 550,000 members. Particulars as to the expenses of management were obtained from sixty societies, comprising about 500,000 of the above number of members. One society (the Blackburn Philanthropic), with the large membership of 130,000, enjoyed the solitary distinction of keeping its management expenses down to the very low point of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total expenditure. In thirty-nine societies, numbering 250,000 members, or one-half of the whole, the cost of management on the total expenditure varied from 17 to 30 per cent. In the rest the expenses for the most part were not much below 17 per cent.

The success of these *local Collecting Burial Societies*, which came into existence in the forty years between 1820 and 1860, and whose operations were confined chiefly to the great towns in the counties mentioned and to a small radius beyond them, proved that there was a wider field of enterprise open to the class of persons whose inclinations led them to undertake such offices as that of collectors, presidents, secretaries, &c., to societies of this kind.

Accordingly, a new variety of these societies has sprung up, chiefly within the last thirty years, called *General Collecting Burial Societies*, whose operations range over the whole kingdom. A list of twenty of the most important of them is given by the Commissioners, sixteen of which have been formed since 1850, with an estimated membership of 800,000 for England and Wales (leaving for the moment Scotland and Ireland out of the account), thus giving a total of 1,350,000 members of the principal *Local* and *General Collecting Burial Societies* in England and Wales, according to the most recent statistics available in 1874. Resort must be had to the Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies for an account of them since that date. The Report for the year 1877 (Part II. A. p. 246) contains a return from thirty of the larger *Local* and *General Collecting Burial Societies*, and shows a total membership of at least 1,600,000

for England and Wales.¹ Upon the returns received in the year 1878 the Chief Registrar remarks (Part I. p. 7) that "most of the larger collecting societies show more or less increase in numbers, funds, and receipts." And it is also worthy of notice that so numerous are the members of these Collecting Burial Societies that they constitute more than 43 per cent. of the members returned for the whole of the Friendly Societies in England and Wales.—(*Ibid.* p. 6.)

To these societies have to be added a remarkable group of *Companies* registered under the Life Assurance Companies Act of 1870, but carrying on the same business as the Burial Societies, under the title of "Burial (or Industrial Assurance) Companies." Of these, nine, existing or dissolved, were referred to in the evidence laid before the Commissioners; but "Companies" having been somewhat beyond the scope of their inquiries, they only examined into the details of the most conspicuous of them, *The Prudential*, the growth of which is noticed by the Commissioners as having been very remarkable. In 1867 it had 358,000 members, in 1872 it numbered 1,013,041, showing that it had nearly trebled in five years. This number had again greatly increased in 1877, the report for that year stating, on the authority of the return made to the Board of Trade, under the Life Assurance Companies Act, that "the number of policies in force, and consequently the number of members existing in the Industrial (Burial) Branch of that Company at the end of that year, was 3,216,190. Adding the number of members given for these Local and General Burial Societies and the Prudential Company together, they amounted in 1877 to a total of at least 4,816,190, to which, as mentioned above, there was an increase in 1878; thus plainly showing how largely the wage-earning classes in this country are interested in the honest and economical management of these institutions.

And this will further appear when it is borne in mind how large are the funds with which these institutions have to deal. The Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for 1877 states the assets of the societies receiving contributions by collectors as amounting to £1,032,752. The Report of Mr. Dowey, the Actuary of the Prudential Company on its Industrial Branch, for the year 1876, states that on the 2,643,665 policies in existence in that year, yielding a premium income of £980,575, the sum insured was £22,303,959. And Mr. Sutton, the Actuary to the Friendly Societies' Office, in commenting on the Prudential Company's accounts for the year 1877, shows the number of policies to have increased to 3,216,190, yielding a premium income of £1,227,803,

(1) Deduction being made of one-fifth of the total number returned (1,998,325) for double insurances, as in the estimate of the Commissioners in 1874.

and insuring approximately the sum of £27,927,000. These amounts have considerably increased since 1877, the number of policies according to the report of the company for 1880, issued in March, 1881, being close upon 4,898,500, the premium income £1,608,849, and the sum insured may be safely stated at about £36,594,000.

Now it is obvious that the organization of these institutions, and its results, are a matter of the greatest moment to those who intrust to them such large sums from their earnings to purchase the object aimed at. Let us see what that organization is, how it has worked, what attempts have been made to improve it, how far they have been effectual, and what more is required.

The organization of these General Burial Societies and Companies remains substantially as described by the Commissioners on Friendly Societies in 1874. They are managed, with a few exceptions, by practically self-elected and irresponsible committees. As the members of these societies are scattered over wide areas, often in counties far distant from the chief office, only those who live near it can exercise any control even if disposed to attend the general meetings.

Under the committee is a large body of collectors. These are generally men of the labouring class who give their whole time to the work of collecting. They must necessarily be very numerous as they have to seek contributions over large districts. In the largest society (the Royal Liver, whose chief office is in Liverpool) they were estimated to be from 2,000 to 4,000; no exact account being accessible. In the Prudential Insurance Company they were stated to amount to 4,000.

In describing the manner in which the collectors are paid, the Commissioners remark that the position of a collector in a General Burial Society must offer enormous attractions. He is paid by entrance fees, a commission of 25 per cent. on collections, a present of the first or second six weeks' contributions of every new member, transfer fees, and other perquisites which do not figure as a rule in the reports or balance-sheets; all these sources yielding from about £200 to £400 a year, "a very fortunate position," as remarked by one of the witnesses, "for a man originally a labouring man at £1 a week." And beyond this he may possibly work his way into the committee of management, which includes all the paid officers, and receive a salary varying from about £400 up to certainly £800 a year. It is obvious, therefore, that the society must be carried on in what is called the collector spirit. And so sure a source of income is a collector's book when once it contains a considerable number of members, that it is the subject of habitual sale, the prices rising up to £600 and £700.

In addition to the committee-men, the permanent officers, and the collectors, there are agents or "district managers;" and also, when two or more of these societies are competing with each other in the same locality, "a crowd of canvassers," thrown out to prepare the way for a regular collector, and paid about 30s. a week.

With all these sources of expense the cost of management must necessarily be great. In a list of twenty of the more important bodies of this class given to the Commissioners in 1874, with a total of 1,426,073 members, nine of the larger ones, with a membership of 1,136,000, returned a ratio of managing expenses which averaged nearly 44 per cent. on the contributions, the remark being added that these figures were probably understated. The expenses of five out of the nine ranged between 50 and 55 per cent. Three years later Mr. Sutton, in his Report to the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies for 1877 above mentioned, states that the management expenses of the twenty-seven collecting societies which made returns, with 1,725,584 members, averaged 41 per cent.; but the data were founded in many cases on "a loose system of accounts," so that "the particulars were to be received with caution." Mr. Sutton adds that of the £585,280 received from the members of those twenty-seven societies in the year reported on (1876), £245,533, or about 40 per cent., was paid in expenses of management; out of which sum 89·2 per cent. went for salaries, commissions, travelling, and perquisites.

And of the Prudential Assurance Company, numbering at the end of 1877 in the Industrial Branch 3,216,190 members (nearly doubling the total number of the societies), Mr. Sutton says that the expenses of management were "about 53 per cent. of the contributions." The report of the company of March, 1881, already adverted to, which gives the *premium income* for 1880 as £1,608,849 (the numbers of members having increased to 4,898,509), states also that the management expenses were 31·9 per cent. of that income.

But the account would stand very differently if the percentage be taken not upon the premium income, but upon the contributions, as was done by Mr. Sutton with the accounts of 1877. That brings into view the bonuses to the collectors for new business and other items, which, although coming out of the pockets of the new members, are not brought to account in the calculation of the percentage of the expenses made by the company. These being added, as by Mr. Sutton in 1877, the percentage of management expenses for 1880 should, instead of 31·9, be 47 per cent.

Of the total premium income of £1,608,849, no less than £753,455 was spent in salaries, bonuses to collectors, office expenses, and other business charges.

This, moreover, is not the only fact which shows the expensive nature of this kind of society. In an ordinary burial society, if a

reserve fund is accumulated, each member has an interest in it, and may hope to participate in its advantages. The reserve fund of the Prudential Company is shown by the report of 1880 to amount to £1,318,517. The whole of this sum that may remain after satisfying all claims belongs to a small number of shareholders who have paid up a capital of only £24,920.

Seeing how heavy a tax is levied on the contributors to these societies and companies, it becomes a matter of much interest to know what class of persons is subject to it. It is unfortunately the very poorest; it is those who, being the most ignorant, are easily induced by the collectors of the competing societies to join them, without sufficient forethought as to whether it would be to their interest to do so; who can hardly be expected to understand the rules even if they could read them, and who, therefore, are liable to lose their membership from some neglect of them. And it is apparent from the manner in which the collector is paid that not only is it his interest to get every member of the family upon his book (for otherwise it is hardly worth his while to make the weekly call for the penny per head of subscription), but it was, and still is for the most part, notwithstanding some efforts to counteract the practice, even more his interest that the members should drop off from the society by reason of non-payment of their contributions. It is also the interest of the societies themselves that new members should be "made and dropped" as quickly as possible. The "general burial societies," the Commissioners remark (§ 503), "in many cases absolutely maintain themselves by their 'lapses.'" Irrespective of the interests of the collectors and the societies in this process, large numbers of the members themselves, being "for the most part the poorest in the community amongst whom any idea of prudence had taken root, are liable to be temporarily unable to continue their contributions, and therefore lose their membership; and as in general no facilities are afforded to them to recover their position, and the few who do are subject to disadvantage, all that they have paid for themselves, their wives, and children is lost."¹ The result was, when the commission reported in 1874, that, between this cause and "official management," it was found that at least "two-thirds," if not "three-fourths" of the people who insured in these institutions allowed after a time their policies to lapse, and that only "about one in eight of the number of insurers continued to the end of life" (§ 503—4). An improvement has taken place since that period in most of these societies, but the Chief Registrar in his report in 1877, founded upon a special report by Mr. Sutton upon the whole of them,

(1) On readmission, age is taken into account, and the member is only entitled to a reduced benefit. In the Prudential Company "the power of reinstalment is exercised to the extent of 10 per cent. of the lapses" (4th Report, §§ 515, 562).

has still to say that "the large amount of lapses in these societies (which affords probably the only explanation of their continued existence) appears from the fact that, whilst out of the total number of 1,725,584 members, barely 34,219 died during the year, 182,011 went off the books," or about one in every nine members. Also, commenting on the same report on the accounts of the Prudential Company, Mr. Sutton states that, with a membership nearly doubling the total of those societies, the Prudential Company showed a much higher rate of lapse than the average of theirs. And the report of Mr. Bailey, the actuary of the company, for the same year is nearly to the same effect, namely, "that many of the policies are allowed to lapse after short periods; thus, of the policies that were existing at the date of the last valuation, about five years ago, about 58 per cent. only are now on the books."

It follows that with their present membership—and on the data above given it may be now stated as not less than 2,000,000 for the General Burial Societies, and is in fact 4,898,509 in the Prudential Company, in all very little short of 7,000,000—in the course of every year, on a moderate estimate, very nearly 700,000 contributors to these bodies lose their membership, and with it all their contributions.

But these numbers by no means exhaust the whole of the contributors to Burial Societies or companies throughout the United Kingdom. Among the large number of Friendly Societies required to make annual returns, and which "are still making default altogether," as the Chief Registrar complains in his last report (1877), there are numerous Burial Societies; and the Burial Clubs, which run their short course in the small towns and villages, are beyond the reach of computation, and escape public notice altogether. The full aggregate number of the poorer classes of the population who suffer from the costly or untrustworthy agencies to which they have recourse for the purpose of insurance on death, must therefore be far greater than that represented in the preceding paragraph from such data as are at hand.

Nevertheless, it may be of use to represent the actual money loss that must be incurred even upon the estimated numbers for the general Burial Societies and the Prudential Company as above given.

The payments of the contributors to obtain from £3 to £4 on the death of a child, and £6 on the death of an adult, are uniform—namely, 1d. per head per week, or 4s. 4d. per year.

That sum upon the 700,000 contributors who annually go off the books would, for one year's membership, amount in round numbers to £150,000. Therefore, if the calculation of the societies and the Prudential Company be right, that the average duration of membership is between eight and nine years, the total sum lost to 700,000 of their contributors in, say every eight years, would be £1,200,000.

The sums that in a few exceptional cases are got back by those who go off the books must be a mere trifle, as exemplified by the fact mentioned by Mr. Sutton, that "only £227 was paid away among the 182,011 members who withdrew from the societies" in the year reported on (1876).


But it may be asked, supposing a man should ultimately turn out to be one of the fortunate eight or nine in every hundred contributors (as estimated by the Commissioners, § 504), who have kept up their subscriptions till the end of life, what will he have paid for the £6 his family will then be entitled to for his burial? If when his children grew up he discontinued paying for them, his own subscription of 1d. per week for forty years from, it may be, the age of 25 to 65, would have amounted, without interest, to £8 13s. 4d., and with the accumulated interest to about £16 7s., or nearly three times more than the sum which his family will receive.

Now, considering that during the whole of this time nearly a half-penny out of every penny he has contributed will have gone in the expenses of management if he was a member either of one of the general Burial Societies or of the great Prudential Company, it is painfully manifest what a vast number among the humbler, the most confiding, the least helpful of the wage-earning classes are blindly led to spend, in the pursuit of an object that does them honour, a sum enormously beyond what would procure for them that object could the desired facilities be put in their way by the Government.

The leading facts which I have related, and many other abuses which I have not stopped to mention, but which may be found in §§ 465 to 539 of the Fourth Report of the Commissioners on Friendly Societies (1874), were for many years previously to the year 1868 brought to the notice of the public in the annual reports of the then Registrar of Friendly Societies, Mr. Tidd Pratt. In that year the late Lord Lichfield brought in the Bill already adverted to, "to amend the laws relating to Friendly Societies and to small Government annuities, and the assuring of payment of money on death." This Bill aimed in the first 15 clauses at putting an end to a large proportion of the abuses above described, and in its 16th or last clause proposed "that the limitation that the Post Office assurances on death should not be under £20 should be repealed." The Bill, as already mentioned; did not pass. But in 1875, a flood of new light having in the previous year been thrown upon the subject by the report of the Friendly Societies Commission, a measure was introduced by the Government embodying most of Lord Lichfield's proposals, except unfortunately, the one relating to the sum that might be insured for on death. Some other clauses concerning Friendly Societies were added on the recommendation of the Commissioners, and after much opposition the Bill became law.

The number of abuses in these general Burial Societies and Companies which that Act (38 and 39 Vict. c. 60) sought by its 30th section to correct, may be seen by the following short epitome. It requires that a copy of the rules must be given to every member at the cost of only 1d., together with a printed policy also for 1d.; that a written or printed notice must be given of a contribution being in arrear before the member can be struck off; that no member can be transferred from one society to another without his consent in writing; that the collectors are to take no part in the management, or in the proceedings at the meetings of the society; that there must be yearly meetings duly advertised; that the balance-sheet must be subject to inspection and duly delivered to any member on demand; that the annual returns to the Registrar must be certified by professional accountants; that in all disputes recourse must be had to a County Court or Court of Summary Jurisdiction; that there must be an annual audit of the accounts either by one public auditor or by two persons appointed by the society; that there must be quinquennial valuation returns made to the Registrar; that all cases of payment at death must be made only on a Registrar's certificate of death; that in case of the death of a child under 10, payment must be made to the parent or his representatives; that no one under 16 can be considered as a member (that is, with power to vote) in any society registered after the passing of the Act, except in the case of societies composed solely of minors, and then only under certain regulations. There are also stringent rules to prevent a larger sum than £6 from being received on the death of any child under 5 years, or on the death of a child under 10 years a larger sum than £10.

No sufficient means having been provided by this Act to insure these improvements in the practice of these societies and companies being carried into effect, the extent to which they are adopted depends upon the good-will of the respective committees. Mr. Sutton accordingly, in his Actuarial Report upon them for the year succeeding the passing of the Act, notes the following as some of the abuses then uncorrected in one or other of the institutions reported on. The rate of lapses was still in most cases high; the returns in many cases imperfect; the expenses of management excessive; in some cases there was no separate fund provided for the management expenses, as required by the rules; in others the expenditure on that account was above that which the rules authorised, as where in three cases, 20, 30, and 36 per cent. was authorised and 50 per cent. was spent; or the amount authorised was excessive, as where 50 per cent. was authorised; or there was no fixed limit; or the payments to collectors or agents were not brought to account; or investments were made in unauthorised securities.



Undertakings were given in regard to some of these matters that they should be corrected in future; but many of the particulars most important to the members are not within the powers of the Act, and, from the circumstances of the case, could scarcely be brought within it.

It appears that the practice continues of insuring a child in several societies, and the law is said to be evaded by the statement that the sum paid on the death of a child who is known to be insured also in other societies is given for "charitable purposes."

In the last Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for 1878, recently published, these collecting burial societies are not reported upon by the actuary, for the reason, as I am informed, that their general conditions remain substantially the same.

It is to be hoped that the time is near when the Government will act upon the recommendation of the Friendly Societies Commission by reducing the sum that may be insured for on death to £5, and thus open to all the industrial classes a way of escape from the extravagant payments required by these societies and companies, and from the great losses that fall upon so large a proportion of their contributors, who, from some accident or other, cease their contributions. Should the Government reduce the sum that can be insured for on death from the present limit of £20 to £5, it is easy to see how great the gain to the industrial classes would be. Any labouring man of any degree of prudence could have at his command at the age of 21—2 the sum of £1 18s. 1d. This sum, paid down at that age at any post office, would, according to the present scale, insure him £5 on death. Possibly a small sum, say 2s., would have to be added to the cost, to cover increased office expenses arising from the reduction of the present minimum of £20 to £5. To procure an additional £1 at death about 8s. would be required, making a total of £2 8s. to secure him £6, for which he has hitherto insured himself in some Burial Society, and which it has been shown would have cost him, if he survived to the age of 65, no less than £16 7s., or upwards of six times more than at 21 he could have bought it for from the Government.

And if any one above the age of 21 should be desirous of purchasing the £5 or £6, or any further sum, he would find, on referring to the Post Office tables, that he could do so at the moderate advance of between three and four shillings for every five years of age.

That these societies and companies insuring sums to be paid at death would renew their objection to the introduction of State competition with their business is very probable, "as was the case," the Commissioners remark, "in 1864, when Mr. Gladstone found himself obliged to place the minimum of insurance at £20." "But," the

Commissioners added, "this objection does not appear to us to be entitled to much weight, and carries its own refutation with it" (§ 852). That their business would be considerably reduced in that particular cannot admit of doubt; but it is easy to point out that a vast amount would still remain to them, and in the particular sphere in which their intervention is useful.

Of the number of members of these Burial Societies and Companies, which may now be stated to be at least 7,000,000 (see page 708), the proportion of children and women amounts to upwards of one-half. This fact is vouched for by one of the Assistant-Commissioners, Sir George Young, in the following terms:—"Agents of the large collecting societies have told me, and I have tested the fact by an examination of their books, that a great majority of the names on their lists are those of children and women" (§ 467). The father, as a rule, joins one of these societies, and subscribes his penny a week for each child soon after its birth. If he is negligent about it the collector soon calls, and "never rests satisfied, after he has insured one life, until he gets the whole household in his book" (*Ibid.*). The collector, by his periodical calls for the penny, saves all trouble; and, accordingly, widows, single women, and all persons of the poorer and least helpful class, especially those living in remote villages, readily become his clients. This great and widespread and creditable desire among even the poorest of the population to secure for themselves and their families, on the occasion of a death, a sum that will provide a decent burial is not likely to decline; it may fairly be expected that, as their intelligence becomes more and more developed, the spark of pride which makes them resent the idea of a pauper funeral, and which happily even the long course of maladministration of the old Poor Law did not extinguish, may even gain greater vigour, and lead to greater efforts towards an honourable independence. These societies, therefore, are never likely to be in want of contributors on a very large scale in point of numbers. Neither did the Friendly Societies Commissioners, who did not shrink from the fullest exposure of their defects and abuses, come to any conclusion adverse to their continued existence. Their words are, "We are far from saying that the method of collecting from house to house is a vicious one in itself, nay, that it is not the one most appropriate and economical where the individual contributions are reduced to a minimum, as they are when confined to the purpose of securing burial benefits; we would not even deny that it may be virtually indispensable in such a case" (§ 545).

The result that would follow from the reduction of the present £20 to a limit of £5 as the smallest sum for which a person may insure on death, would not prevent parents from making insurances for their children, inasmuch as the State does not undertake the insurance

of any one under 16 years of age. It would, on the contrary, better enable the parents to keep up their payments for their children, inasmuch as, presumably, both father and mother would have purchased their own insurances from the Government before marriage. The opportunity of a Government insurance of £5, or any further sum at death, would also be of great service to all those who, between the ages of 16 and 21, would be in a position to save out of their wages and pay down in one sum the £1 15s. 8d., or £1 18s. 1d. (or the slightly larger sum already indicated), which, between these ages, would purchase it once for all. They would thus be released from the perpetual burden of the weekly payment, and the risk of losing all they had paid either by the failure of the Society or Burial Club, which is of such frequent occurrence, or by their own inability from illness or other accidental circumstance to keep up their payments. But all such young persons would have a strong motive for continuing the penny a week subscription to their Burial Society during the period between 16 and 21, in order, in case of death between those years, to secure for themselves a decent funeral.

The practice of paying for a few years and then, by the chances of life, ceasing to be members, may be of great advantage to the societies and companies in question; but it affords no argument whatever which can enable them to oppose, on any fair grounds, the opening to the labouring classes a cheaper and better mode of attaining what they desire. And were this boon granted to them, another important step would be taken towards directing into safe and desirable channels the weekly savings of the industrial classes, now so often intrusted to clubs sooner or later ending in insolvency or wasted in these expensive societies and companies. If their savings were then always invested in trustworthy, durable, and economical securities, they would be found sufficient to provide (in the words of the Friendly Societies Commissioners' Report of 1874, § 833) not only burial money, but sick pay and an annuity after the age of 65, and thus to raise them, in ordinary cases, above the risk of pauperism.

HUGH SEYMOUR TREMENHEERE.

POSTSCRIPT.—The Return to an Order of the House of Commons moved for by Lord Lymington, "of the Paupers in the Workhouses of England on the 31st March, 1881, who, having been members of a Benefit Society, had then ceased to be members," on account of non-payment of contributions, withdrawal, or dismissal, or on account of the breaking up of the society, has just been issued, and supplies another reason in favour of the legislation pointed to in this article.

The total number of indoor adult male paupers in England and

Wales on that day, who had ceased to be members of benefit societies, was 11,304, in 576 out of the 647 Unions from which the returns were received; giving an average number of 19 per Union.

I find that, in round numbers, 12 of these 19 had lost their membership by reason of non-payment of contributions, withdrawal, or dismissal, and 7 in consequence of the breaking up of the society.

Taking the fifty Unions that contained the largest numbers who had lost their membership, I find the average in these to be 75 per Union; Liverpool leading with 230, Manchester with 152, Salford with 148, Birmingham with 113, St. Olave's, Southwark, with 121, and Lambeth with 109.

The numbers are generally small in the country districts. But wherever former members of benefit societies who have lost their membership from the causes named, are found in the Workhouse, whether their numbers are great or small, their position must operate more or less among their friends and neighbours as a discouragement to making provision for the future.

But this number of 11,304 adult male paupers who have lost the benefits they had subscribed for is but a trifle compared with the 700,000 persons of all ages and both sexes still above pauperism, spread over the country, who annually go off the books of the societies, and lose all they have contributed.

The best remedy lies in the direction of purchasing from the Government in early life, by a comparatively small sum paid down once for all, their "burial money" and an annuity after the age of 65; also their "sick-pay," if the Government would undertake that business, which I presume to think I showed to be practicable in the article in the *Nineteenth Century* already adverted to.

But if public opinion is not ripe for that plan, a vigorous effort is surely demanded to oblige the present societies to give better guarantees that they can and will fulfil their contracts. Of the 11,304 adult male paupers included in the Return, who had lost their membership, no less than 3,913 had done so by the breaking up of the society. Of these latter, 1,026 had the additional mortification of having been members for between 10 and 20 years; 612 between 20 and 30 years; 555 for 30 years and upwards. The remaining 1,720 had been members for less than 10 years.

H. S. T.

DISGUST: A DRAMATIC MONOLOGUE.

A woman and her husband, having been converted from free thought to Calvinism, and being utterly miserable in consequence, resolve to end themselves by poison. The man dies, but the woman is rescued by application of the stomach-pump.

I.

PILLS? talk to me of your pills? Well, that, I must say, is cool. Can't bring my old man round? he was always a stubborn old fool. If I hadn't taken precautions—a warning to all that wife—He might not have been dead, and I might not have been alive.

II.

You would like to know, if I please, how it was that our troubles began?

You see, we were brought up Agnostics, I and my poor old man. And we got some idea of selection and evolution, you know—Professor Huxley's doing—where does he expect to go!

III.

Well, then came trouble on trouble on trouble—I may say, a peck—

And his cousin was wanted one day on the charge of forging a cheque—

And his puppy died of the mange—my parrot choked on its perch. This was the consequence, was it, of not going weekly to church?

IV.

So we felt that the best if not only thing that remained to be done On an earth everlastingly moving about a perpetual sun, Where worms breed worms to be eaten of worms that have eaten their betters—

And reviewers are barely civil—and people get spiteful letters— And a famous man is forgot ere the minute hand can tick nine— Was to send in our P.P.C., and purchase a packet of strychnine.

V.

Nay—but first we thought it was rational—only fair—

To give both parties a hearing—and went to the meeting-house there,

At the curve of the street that runs from the Stag to the old Blue Lion.

“Little Zion” they call it—a deal more “little” than “Zion.”

VI.

And the preacher preached from the text, "Come out of her."

Hadn't we come?

And we thought of the Shepherd in *Pickwick*—and fancied a flavour
of rum

Balmily borne on the wind of his words—and my man said, "Well,
Let's get out of this, my dear—for his text has a brimstone smell."

VII.

So we went, O God, out of chapel—and gazed, ah God, at the sea.
And I said nothing to him. And he said nothing to me.

VIII.

And there, you see, was an end of it all. It was obvious, in fact,
That, whether or not you believe in the doctrine taught in a tract,
Life was not in the least worth living. Because, don't you see?
Nothing that can't be, can, and what must be, must. Q.E.D.
And the infinitesimal sources of Infinite Unideality
Curve in to the central abyss of a sort of a queer Personality
Whose refraction is felt in the nebulae strewn in the pathway of
Mars

Like the parings of nails *Æonian*—clippings and snippings of
stars—

Shavings of suns that revolve and evolve and involve—and at times
Give a sweet astronomical twang to remarkably hobbling rhymes.

IX.

And the sea curved in with a moan—and we thought how once—
before

We fell out with those atheist lecturers—once, ah, once and no
more,

We read together, while midnight blazed like the Yankee flag,
A reverend gentleman's work—the Conversion of Colonel Quagg.
And out of its pages we gathered this lesson of doctrine pure—
Zephaniah Stockdologer's gospel—a word that deserves to endure
Infinite millions on millions of infinite *Æons* to come—
"Vocation," says he, "is vocation, and duty duty. Some."

X.

And duty, said I, distinctly points out—and vocation, said he,
Demands as distinctly—that I should kill you, and that you should
kill me.

The reason is obvious—we cannot exist without creeds—who can?
So we went to the chemist's—a highly respectable church-going
man—

And bought two packets of poison. You wouldn't have done so
Wait.

It's evident, Providence is not with you, ma'am, the same thing as
Fate.

Unconscious cerebration educes God from a fog,

But spell God backwards, what then? Give it up? the answer is,
dog.

(I don't exactly see how this last verse is to scan,

But that's a consideration I leave to the secular man.)

XI.

I meant of course to go with him—as far as I pleased—but first
To see how my old man liked it—I thought perhaps he might
burst.

I didn't wish it—but still it's a blessed release for a wife—

And he saw that I thought so—and grinned in derision—and
threatened my life

If I made wry faces—and so I took just a sip—and he—

Well—you know how it ended—he didn't get over me.

XII.

Terrible, isn't it? Still, on reflection, it might have been worse.

He might have been the unhappy survivor, and followed my hearse.

"Never do it again"? Why, certainly not. You don't

Suppose I should think of it, surely? But anyhow—there—I
won't.

HAS CONSERVATISM INCREASED IN ENGLAND SINCE THE LAST REFORM BILL?

As Mr. Gladstone and his Cabinet stand pledged to attempt to extend the suffrage in the counties before they again appeal to the country, a fitting opportunity presents itself for the inquiry at the head of this article. The general elections of 1868 and 1880 will, if the Liberal party is successful during the present Parliament in its endeavour to alter the electoral laws, be convenient data from which to deduce a trustworthy answer. We know how, in 1874, the vaticinations of the prophets were falsified; but the question of vital interest is this—Did the reigns of a Liberal and a Conservative Government for, speaking very roughly, six years each in succession, cause Liberalism or Conservatism to make the greater progress, or did the one party advance equally in favour with the other?

It may be stated at the outset that the aim of the following pages is not to serve a party purpose, but solely to give a true and faithful solution of the proposed problem, and that there has not been the slightest attempt so to arrange the figures involved in the question as to favour either the one or the other political body. To place this assertion beyond a doubt I will briefly mention the principles upon which the following analysis is based, and make a few general remarks upon the manner in which such an investigation should be carried on. And to avoid misconception it may be added that, for the sake of brevity, by "England" is meant "England and Wales," and "Tory" is used as synonymous with "Conservative."

The advantages of treating a subject scientifically—in other words, in a manner consonant with the rules of logic and justice—have been often pointed out; but it is astonishing, when we reflect upon the excessive crudeness of the modern method of discoursing on political matters, no statesman ever ventures to deal with the anomalies involved in our electoral system in any other than a hand-to-mouth spirit, and to this very day we treat the claims of Ireland to her share in the number of members of Parliament on an entirely false basis. Only a short time ago the Irish members were solemnly warned that as the census had shown that their country contained only one-seventh of the population of the United Kingdom they would run the risk, if they made themselves troublesome, of having the 105 members allotted to their country out of the total of 658 reduced considerably in number. And similarly in the redistribution schemes of Reform Bills, and in popular controversies, population is always taken as the basis of comparison of the claims of

rival constituencies. But the slightest reflection shows that population is no safe guide. Were the proportions of men, women and children always the same, were the electoral qualification in all countries and constituencies the same, and were the ratio of enfranchised to unenfranchised males always the same, then no doubt population would serve as a standard. But it is notoriously otherwise. Ireland contains about 230,000 out of a total of about 3,030,000 electors in the United Kingdom, and is therefore, under present conditions, entitled, not to one-seventh, but only to about to one-thirteenth, of the 658 members. Of course, if the franchise is extended, this proportion may become larger; but the fact remains indisputable that this proportion of electors, and not of population, is the true one in all such cases of considering the claims of mere numbers, as such. The other considerations of expediency and policy rest on an entirely different ground.

In politics, as in all other matters, those who have never tried to draw correct inferences will be surprised to find how difficult a business it is. There is not one politician in a thousand who can state with even an approach to accuracy the legitimate deductions from a general election with regard to the progress of the rival parties. Either he will omit something of importance, or he will imply something which he did not actually know as a fact, but which he unconsciously infers must have taken place. The *Daily Thunderer* avows that the Liberals gained ground among the county electors at the last general election. It turns out that all that is meant is that in some counties in which there had never been a contest for many years, and in which the relative state of feeling at the previous general election was pure guess-work, the Tory sitting members who had before been returned unopposed had been defeated when their claims were challenged. But no one knows, no one ever can know, whether they would have met with a greater or less defeat if their seats had been attacked on the earlier occasion, and to state that the Liberals had gained ground in the interval is to assert that which is incapable of proof and unworthy of attention.

The customary and the crudest manner of discovering whether Tory principles have relatively advanced between 1868 and 1880 is to say that on the former occasion there were 265 Tory members returned to the House, and on the latter only 233. Therefore it is inferred that, instead of advancing, they have declined. But the slightest consideration will show that, putting aside many other grave objections to such a superficial method, no reliance can be placed on the statement. By precisely the same reasoning, since in 1868 there were 393 Liberal members, and in 1880 there were only 357, Liberal principles also declined. The explanation is to be found in the circumstance that in the interval a third party, the

Home Rulers, had sprung up, and we are confronted with the dilemma that we must discover some means of finding out the proportions in which they have drawn their adherents from the two previously existing parties.

Numberless examples could be given, were it worth while, of the untrustworthy way in which hasty generalizations are put forth with confidence. It will, however, be more useful to attempt the solution of the problem under discussion.

Now, in the first place, it is clear that the *absolute* increase of Tory and Liberal voters in England between 1868 and 1880 can never be ascertained, for the simple reason that there were many constituencies in either one or both of those years in which no contests took place. And this leads us at once to observe that by considering the case of the remaining constituencies, *i.e.* those in which there were contests between the two parties on both occasions, we shall obtain a trustworthy standard by which to gauge the *relative* increase of the two parties.

In the second place we must beware lest we fall into the error, almost universal, of assuming the proportion of Tory and Liberal feeling in any group of constituencies to be in the same ratio as that of the gross votes cast on each side. What is really wanted is the proportion of Tory and Liberal voters. How these may be determined in a way approximately correct enough for all practical purposes has been shown in my article, "Voters, not Votes," in the *Contemporary Review* for October, 1880.

In the third place it is advantageous to know whether the Tory and Liberal voters have increased equally in all classes of constituencies, from the smallest to the largest; and, if not, how they compare with each other.

Now there were, in round numbers, 2,500,000 registered electors in England in 1880, and as they had 493 members allotted to them, each member represented on an average about 5,000 voters. Hence I have arranged the constituencies which are determined for us by our first rule in five tables, the nature of which has been fixed as follows:—In the first table have been placed all those constituencies which, in 1880, contained less than 1,500 registered electors. These may be called *very small* constituencies, being such as would, if mere numbers alone were the guide, be disfranchised. In the second table have been placed all those constituencies which, in 1880, contained between 1,500 and 7,500 registered electors. These may be called *small* constituencies, being such as would, if mere numbers alone were the guide, return one member apiece. In the third table have been placed all those constituencies which, in 1880, contained between 7,500 and 12,500 registered electors. These may be called *moderate-sized* constituencies, being such as would return two members apiece.

In the fourth table have been placed all those constituencies which, in 1880, contained between 12,500 and 17,500 registered electors. These may be called *large* constituencies, being such as would return three members apiece. And in the fifth table have been placed those constituencies which, in 1880, contained over 17,500 registered electors. These may be called *very large* constituencies, being such as would either return four members apiece, or be subdivided.

Let us then at once proceed to—

TABLE I.

CONSTITUENCIES HAVING ELECTORATES OF UNDER 1,500 IN 1880, AND CONTESTED BY LIBERALS AND TORIES IN BOTH 1868 AND 1880.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
1. Abingdon . . .	—	327	1	428	1	397	—	386
2. Andover . . .	1	377	1	405	—	307	—	364
3. Berwick . . .	2	639	2	651	—	466	—	505
4. Bewdley . . .	—	418	1	598	1	518	—	530
5. Brecknock . . .	—	357	1	438	1	372	—	379
6. Buckingham . . .	1	463	1	528	—	338	—	520
7. Chichester . . .	—	433	—	467	1	603	1	602
8. Chippenham . . .	—	359	—	455	1	418	1	478
9. Cockermouth . . .	1	620	1	582	—	388	—	380
10. Devizes . . .	—	321	—	388	1	419	1	446
11. Droitwich . . .	—	603	1	862	1	790	—	368
12. Evesham . . .	—	303	1	382	1	347	—	373
13. Guildford . . .	1	535	—	571	—	515	1	705
14. Harwich . . .	—	141	—	310	1	328	1	368
15. Helston . . .	1	494	—	421	—	374	1	461
16. Hertford . . .	—	345	—	400	1	434	1	564
17. Horsham . . .	—	380	—	504	1	380	1	605
18. Knaresborough . . .	1	362	1	357	—	347	—	331
19. Leominster . . .	—	147	—	354	1	432	1	457
20. Lewes . . .	1	601	—	580	—	587	1	717
21. Lichfield . . .	—	474	—	537	1	525	1	553
22. Ludlow . . .	—	170	—	343	1	408	1	525
23. Lymington . . .	—	199	—	239	1	330	1	431
24. Malmesbury . . .	—	314	—	310	1	337	1	603
25. Marlow . . .	—	314	—	354	1	345	1	506
26. Midhurst . . .	—	262	—	286	1	375	1	500
27. Northallerton . . .	—	372	—	383	1	386	1	483
28. Petersfield . . .	1	370	1	406	—	222	—	320
29. Ripon . . .	1	554	1	591	—	408	—	362
30. Rye . . .	—	499	1	626	1	513	—	618
31. Tewkesbury . . .	1	355	1	350	—	279	—	340
32. Thirsk . . .	—	390	—	422	1	416	1	495
33. Wallingford . . .	—	358	1	582	1	453	—	541
34. Wareham . . .	1	382	1	451	—	301	—	416
35. Westbury . . .	—	465	—	505	1	492	1	559
36. Woodstock . . .	—	481	—	452	1	502	1	512
Totals . . .	13	14,184	17	16,518	24	15,052	20	17,343

With regard to the very small constituencies whose names appear in the above table, one or two remarks may fitly be made. It has often been alleged that the preservation of these boroughs is one of the articles of the Tory creed, because it is in them that Tory

influence is strongest. Be this as it may, it is at all events well to know that, as a mere matter of fact, the two rival parties are nearly equally balanced, and that while the Tory percentage of the total voters decreased from 51·5 in 1868 to 51·2 in 1880, the Liberal percentage of the total voters increased from 48·5 in 1868 to 48·8 in 1880. No doubt in 1868 the Tories were represented by 24, while the Liberals had only 13, members; and in 1880 the Tories had 20 members, while the number of Liberal members had risen to 17. But on each of these occasions the preponderance of Tory over Liberal members was due, not to the strength of the Tory support, but to the nature of our present system of representation. On some future occasion it is very likely that while the proportion of Tory to Liberal voters may remain about the same, the number of Liberal members may greatly exceed the number of Tory members. For, indeed, at each general election, had the two parties been represented in accordance with their relative strength, the Tories would have had 19, and the Liberals 18, members, the fluctuation and apparent increase of Liberal strength as shown by their reducing their minority of 11 to a minority of only 3 members being simply due to the characteristics inherent in our system of election, and not to any corresponding increase of strength among the electorate. And thus, assuming for the sake of argument that constituencies ought to be disfranchised when they sink below a certain number of electors, the Tory party has no especial need to dread the operation of such a measure.

Pursuing this question of very small constituencies a little further, however, and also for the sake of completeness and convenience of reference, we may take note that the following twenty-two constituencies—Bodmin, Bridgnorth, Bridport, Calne, Cirencester, Dorchester, Eye, Frome, Huntingdon, Launceston, Liskeard, Malton, Marlborough, Newport, Radnor Boroughs, Richmond, St. Ives, Shaftesbury, Stamford, Tavistock, Tiverton and Wilton—also had electorates of under 1,500 in 1880, but were not contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880. On each occasion they returned 16 Liberals and 7 Tories.

Hence, contrary to the popular idea that Tories obtain so much support in the very small constituencies, we find that while in 1868 the Liberals had 29, and in 1880 they had 33, members as their share of those returned by the 58 smallest constituencies in England, in 1868 the Tories had 31, and in 1880 they had only 27, members. So that really the Liberals have the most to lose by a rigorous and fair application of the rule that constituencies should be disfranchised when they contain less than a certain minimum, and become what is called insignificant in numbers.

Let us now turn to—

TABLE II.

CONSTITUENCIES HAVING ELECTORATES OF BETWEEN 1,500 AND 7,500 IN 1880, AND
CONTESTED BY LIBERALS AND TORIES IN BOTH 1868 AND 1880.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
1. Ashton-under-Lyne	—	2,109	1	2,966	1	2,318	—	2,586
2. Aylesbury	1	1,357	2	2,015	1	1,468	—	1,511
3. Banbury	1	772	1	1,018	—	397	—	583
4. Barnstaple	1	729	1	766	1	788	1	855
5. Bath	2	2,333	2	2,706	—	2,024	—	2,300
6. Bedford	2	1,277	2	1,452	—	630	—	1,063
7. Boston	—	978	1	1,275	1	1,213	1	1,381
8. Bury St. Edmunds	1	648	1	1,110	1	714	1	827
9. Cambridge	2	1,868	2	2,356	—	1,413	—	1,953
10. Canterbury	1	1,236	—	1,256	1	1,660	2	1,446
11. Cardiganshire	1	2,074	1	2,406	—	1,918	—	1,605
12. Carlisle	2	2,043	2	2,747	—	1,957	—	1,968
13. Carnarvonshire	1	1,963	1	3,303	—	1,815	—	2,206
14. Chatham	1	2,042	—	2,396	—	1,858	1	2,499
15. Cheltenham	1	1,640	1	2,318	—	1,468	—	2,297
16. Christchurch	1	609	1	1,185	—	560	—	1,117
17. Clitheroe	—	693	1	1,098	1	760	—	882
18. Colchester	2	1,442	2	1,694	—	1,251	—	1,653
19. Crickdale	1	2,844	1	4,350	1	2,221	1	2,094
20. Denbigh District	1	1,318	1	1,424	—	944	—	1,409
21. Derbyshire (E.)	2	2,061	2	3,091	—	1,978	—	2,440
22. Derbyshire (N.)	1	2,770	2	3,300	1	2,698	—	2,827
23. Devonport	2	1,530	—	1,493	—	1,368	2	1,750
24. Dover	1	735	—	1,557	1	1,424	2	1,718
25. Durham	2	804	2	1,195	—	732	—	1,058
26. Essex (E.)	—	2,179	—	2,369	2	2,839	2	2,626
27. Exeter	2	2,282	1	3,038	—	2,122	1	2,568
28. Gloucester	2	1,928	2	2,739	—	1,512	—	2,101
29. Gravesend	1	1,237	1	1,544	—	1,069	—	1,422
30. Hartlepool	—	1,547	1	3,682	1	1,550	—	1,579
31. Hastings	2	1,477	1	1,770	—	920	1	1,873
32. Haverfordwest	1	638	1	686	—	497	—	522
33. Hereford	2	1,035	2	1,413	—	928	—	1,070
34. Ipswich	2	2,258	1	3,050	—	2,044	1	3,061
35. Isle of Wight	1	1,353	1	1,986	—	1,118	—	1,973
36. Kidderminster	1	1,272	1	1,795	—	821	—	1,472
37. King's Lynn	—	1,012	1	1,212	2	1,195	1	1,220
38. Macclesfield	2	2,661	2	2,845	—	2,321	—	2,433
39. Maidstone	2	1,558	—	1,675	—	1,391	2	1,899
40. Maldon	1	657	1	679	—	504	—	661
41. Monmouth District	1	1,618	1	2,258	—	1,449	—	2,197
42. Newark	2	1,053	1	1,028	—	826	1	989
43. Newcastle-under-Lyme	1	913	1	1,214	1	1,423	1	1,484
44. Norfolk (S.)	—	1,679	1	2,906	2	3,076	1	2,911
45. Oxford	2	2,701	2	2,685	—	1,225	—	2,659
46. Pembroke Boroughs	—	1,049	1	1,462	1	1,419	—	1,429
47. Penryn and Falmouth	—	604	2	1,124	2	708	—	824
48. Peterborough	2	1,717	2	1,857	—	167	—	987
49. Plymouth	2	2,076	1	2,404	—	1,506	1	2,413
50. Pontefract	1	797	2	1,092	1	900	—	766
51. Poole	—	563	—	848	1	623	1	854
52. Reading	2	1,624	2	2,400	—	976	—	2,067
53. Rochester	2	1,382	1	1,396	—	703	1	1,353
54. Salisbury	2	714	2	960	—	623	—	835
55. Scarborough	2	1,752	2	2,111	—	742	—	1,572
56. Shrewsbury	1	1,263	2	1,915	1	1,751	—	1,595
57. Shropshire (S.)	—	2,161	—	1,887	2	2,609	2	2,354
58. Southampton	—	2,054	2	3,037	2	2,286	—	2,937

TABLE II.—(continued.)

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
59. Stafford	1	1,148	2	1,422	1	1,124	—	1,190
60. Staleybridge	—	2,078	1	2,706	1	2,405	—	2,542
61. Stroud	2	2,856	2	3,090	—	2,096	—	2,766
62. Taunton	1	998	1	984	1	918	1	1,028
63. Truro	1	545	1	754	1	731	1	481
64. Tynemouth	1	1,098	1	2,844	—	710	—	1,397
65. Wakefield	1	1,557	1	2,191	—	1,512	—	1,796
66. Warrington	1	1,984	1	3,002	—	1,957	—	2,473
67. Warwick	1	567	1	961	1	863	1	722
68. Warwickshire (S.)	—	2,463	1	2,550	2	2,541	1	2,586
69. Weymouth	1	577	1	905	1	750	1	807
70. Whitby	1	894	1	1,072	—	518	—	699
71. Whitehaven	—	771	—	1,072	1	1,125	1	1,204
72. Wigan	2	2,193	—	2,768	—	1,898	2	2,930
73. Wiltshire (N.)	1	2,308	—	2,783	1	2,769	2	2,960
74. Winchester	1	638	1	979	1	840	1	791
75. Windsor	1	803	—	824	—	795	1	995
76. Worcester	1	2,459	2	2,615	1	2,439	—	2,502
Totals	86 112,626		88 147,069		41 105,411		39 128,539	

In this case the Tory percentage of the total voters decreased from 48·3 in 1868 to 46·6 in 1880, while the Liberal percentage of the total voters increased from 51·7 in 1868 to 53·4 in 1880. But, in consequence of the working of our system of representation, the proportion of Tory to Liberal members remained substantially unaltered, although both in 1868 and in 1880 the Liberals obtained many more members than they were fairly entitled to. For while in 1868 they had 86, and in 1880 they had 88, members, under a system of proportionate representation they would in 1868 have had only 66, and in 1880 they would have had only 68, members. The Tories, on the other hand, would have had 61, instead of only 41, members in 1868; while in 1880 they would have had 59, instead of only 39, members. Thus we see that it is not in small constituencies that the Tories obtain a larger share of support than their rivals.

The following fifty-two constituencies—Anglesea, Beaumaris, Bedfordshire, Brecknockshire, Bury, Cambridge (University), Cardigan Burghs, Carmarthen District, Carnarvon Boroughs, Cheshire (E.), Cornwall (W.), Cumberland (W.), Darlington, Denbighshire, Essex (W.), Flint District, Flintshire, Grantham, Grimsby, Hampshire (N.), Huntingdonshire, Hythe, Kendal, Leicestershire (N.), Lincoln, London University, Merionethshire, Montgomery District, Montgomeryshire, Morpeth, Norfolk (N.), Norfolk (W.), Northamptonshire (N.), Northamptonshire (S.), Northumberland (N.), Nottinghamshire (N.), Nottinghamshire (S.), Oxfordshire, Oxford (University), Pembrokeshire, Radnorshire, Rutlandshire, Sandwich, Shoreham, Suffolk (W.), Sussex (W.), Tamworth, Wenlock, Westmoreland, Wiltshire (S.), Worcestershire (W.) and Wycombe—also

had electorates of between 1,500 and 7,500 in 1880, but were not contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880. In 1868 they returned 33 Liberals and 51 Tories, and in 1880, 40 Liberals and 44 Tories.

Thus we see that, taking the whole of the small constituencies into account, while in 1868 the Liberals had 119, and in 1880 they had 128, members as their share of those returned by the 128 small constituencies in England, in 1868 the Tories had only 92, and in 1880 they had only 83, members. So that in this case again it is not the Tories who have any reason to be afraid of a close scrutiny into constituencies which, as regards mere numbers, are over-represented.

Let us now turn to—

TABLE III.

CONSTITUENCIES HAVING ELECTORATES OF BETWEEN 7,500 AND 12,500 IN 1880, AND CONTESTED BY LIBERALS AND TORIES IN BOTH 1868 AND 1880.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
1. Berkshire . . .	1	2,599	1	1,645	2	3,201	2	3,283
2. Birkenhead . . .	—	2,039	—	3,658	1	2,921	1	1,025
3. Brighton . . .	2	3,428	2	4,909	—	2,075	—	4,702
4. Burnley . . .	1	2,620	1	3,943	—	2,238	—	3,217
5. Cardiff . . .	1	2,501	1	3,831	—	2,055	—	3,483
6. Carmarthenshire . .	1	3,280	1	4,101	1	3,555	1	2,871
7. Cheshire (Mid) . .	—	2,482	—	3,311	2	3,064	2	3,784
8. Chester . . .	1	2,312	2	3,176	1	2,198	—	2,023
9. Coventry . . .	—	3,584	2	4,145	2	3,773	—	3,862
10. Cumberland (E.) . .	1	2,472	1	3,061	1	2,621	1	3,161
11. Devon (E.) . . .	—	3,457	—	3,487	2	4,070	2	4,479
12. Durham (S.) . . .	2	4,171	2	5,921	—	3,481	—	4,054
13. Gateshead . . .	1	2,404	1	5,749	—	1,387	—	1,570
14. Gloucestershire (W.)	2	4,924	2	5,240	—	4,394	—	4,640
15. Herefordshire . . .	1	2,076	2	2,814	2	3,346	1	2,765
16. Kent (Mid) . . .	—	2,870	—	3,169	2	3,250	2	3,922
17. Leicestershire (S.) .	—	2,861	1	3,685	2	3,154	1	3,314
18. Lincolnshire (S.) . .	—	2,714	—	3,580	2	4,296	2	4,406
19. Monmouthshire . . .	—	2,338	—	2,973	2	3,643	2	3,414
20. Northampton . . .	2	3,176	2	4,104	—	1,502	—	3,029
21. Preston . . .	—	4,660	—	5,355	2	5,769	2	5,940
22. Rochdale . . .	1	4,455	1	5,614	—	3,270	—	3,716
23. Staffordshire (E.) . .	2	3,780	2	4,713	—	2,792	—	3,429
24. Staffordshire (W.) . .	—	3,270	—	3,454	2	3,841	2	4,045
25. Stockport . . .	1	2,628	2	4,168	1	2,595	—	3,779
26. Stockton . . .	1	2,476	1	4,991	—	867	—	1,432
27. Suffolk (E.) . . .	—	3,183	—	3,504	2	3,635	2	3,928
28. Sussex (E.) . . .	1	3,541	—	2,923	1	3,571	2	4,461
29. Worcestershire (E.) .	1	3,937	2	4,876	1	4,108	—	4,338
30. York . . .	1	3,159	2	4,459	1	3,735	—	3,959
31. York (E. R.) . . .	—	2,603	—	3,707	2	5,943	2	4,627
Totals . . .	24	96,000	31	124,266	34	100,350	27	113,658

In this case, while the Tory percentage of the total voters decreased from 51·1 in 1868 to 47·8 in 1880, the Liberal percentage of the total voters increased from 48·9 in 1868 to 52·2 in 1880. Thus we see that in the moderate-sized constituencies the Tories have fallen back from the position they held in 1868 of slightly outnumbering

their rivals, and now occupy the reverse situation. And it may be observed also that the inherent peculiarity of our present system of representation of unduly favouring the dominant party was exhibited on both occasions, for in 1868, when the Tories were the more numerous, they obtained 34 as against 24 members, instead of only 30 as against 28; while in 1880, when the Liberals were the more numerous, the Tories obtained only 27 as against 31 members, though they were entitled to 28 as against 30.

The following twenty-eight constituencies—Bucks, Cambridge-shire, Cheshire (W.), Cornwall (E.), Derbyshire (S.), Devon (N.), Devon (S.), Dewsbury, Dorsetshire, Essex (S.), Gloucestershire (E.), Halifax, Hampshire (S.), Hertfordshire, Lincolnshire (Mid), Lincolnshire (N.), Middlesborough, Northumberland (S.), Retford (E.), Shropshire (N.), Somerset (E.), Somerset (Mid), Somerset (W.), South Shields, Staffordshire (N.), Surrey (W.), Walsall and Warwickshire (N.)—also had electorates of between 7,500 and 12,500 in 1880, but were not contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880. In 1868 they returned 23 Liberals and 33 Tories, and in 1880, 20 Liberals and 36 Tories.

Hence, taking into account the whole of the moderate-sized constituencies, we notice that while in 1868 the Liberals had only 47, and in 1880 they had only 51, members as their share of those returned by the fifty-nine moderate-sized constituencies in England, in 1868 the Tories had as many as 67, and in 1880 they had as many as 63, members. So that in this case on both occasions the Tories were considerably in excess of their opponents.

Let us now turn to—

TABLE IV.

CONSTITUENCIES HAVING ELECTORATES OF BETWEEN 12,500 AND 17,500 IN 1880 AND CONTESTED BY LIBERALS AND TORIES IN BOTH 1868 AND 1880.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
1. Blackburn . . .	—	4,282	1	6,219	2	4,868	1	5,984
2. Bolton . . .	—	5,444	2	6,819	2	5,955	—	6,462
3. Derby . . .	2	4,836	2	8,311	—	2,492	—	2,730
4. Durham (N.) . .	1	3,917	2	6,067	1	4,649	—	5,092
5. Kent (E.) . . .	—	4,632	—	4,959	2	5,168	2	5,507
6. Kent (W.) . . .	—	3,260	—	2,920	2	3,409	2	6,200
7. Lancashire (N.) .	—	5,296	—	6,500	2	6,757	2	7,839
8. Lancashire (N. E.)	—	3,452	2	6,598	2	3,603	—	5,208
9. Norwich . . .	1	4,247	2	6,531	1	4,325	—	5,137
10. Portsmouth . .	1	3,827	—	6,032	1	5,306	2	6,638
Totals . .	5	43,193	11	60,956	15	46,532	9	56,797

In this case, while the Tory percentage of the total voters decreased from 51·9 in 1868 to 48·2 in 1880, the Liberal percentage of the total voters increased from 48·1 in 1868 to 51·8 in 1880. It is curious that in the large, precisely as in the moderate-sized, constituencies, the Tories have fallen back from the position they held in 1868 o

slightly outnumbering their rivals, and now occupy the reverse situation. But while in 1880 the Tories were about fairly represented by 9 members as against 11, in 1868 they obtained an undue proportion of members, for they had no less than 15 as against 5 members, while in both 1868 and 1880 they were entitled to 10 as against 10.

The following six constituencies—Dudley, Glamorganshire, Huddersfield, Merthyr Tydvil, Sunderland and Swansea—also had electorates of between 12,500 and 17,500 in 1880, but were not contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880. On each occasion they returned 9 Liberals.

Hence, taking the whole of the large constituencies into account, we observe that while in 1868 the Liberals had only 14, in 1880 they had as many as 20, members as their share of those returned by the 16 large constituencies in England, and in 1868 the Tories had as many as 15, while in 1880 they had only 9, members. So that it would be a just presumption that while in 1868 the Tories were about fairly represented, in 1880 they obtained much less than their due share.

Let us now, finally, turn to—

TABLE V.

CONSTITUENCIES HAVING ELECTORATES OF OVER 17,500 IN 1880, AND CONTESTED BY LIBERALS AND TORIES IN BOTH 1868 AND 1880.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
1. Birmingham	3	22,157	3	32,296	—	7,911	—	14,972
2. Bristol	2	8,737	2	12,437	—	6,694	—	9,395
3. Chelsea	2	7,279	2	12,226	—	4,053	—	9,577
4. Finsbury	2	13,450	2	15,688	—	6,137	—	12,800
5. Greenwich	2	6,535	—	8,147	—	4,538	2	9,242
6. Hackney	2	19,415	2	17,672	—	2,633	—	10,322
7. Hull	2	7,078	2	11,954	—	5,914	—	6,417
8. Lambeth	2	14,802	2	19,149	—	7,043	—	16,701
9. Lancashire (S. E.) . .	—	6,989	2	11,302	2	8,156	—	10,526
10. Lancashire (S. W.) .	—	7,177	—	9,437	2	7,703	2	11,163
11. Leeds	2	18,352	2	24,135	1	7,529	1	12,648
12. Leicester	2	6,960	2	10,577	—	2,494	—	4,003
13. London City	3	8,330	1	5,844	1	6,087	3	10,286
14. Manchester	2	21,802	2	24,874	1	14,085	1	20,432
15. Marylebone	2	14,438	2	14,075	—	3,089	—	11,889
16. Middlesex	1	6,452	—	8,876	1	7,850	2	12,611
17. Newcastle-on-Tyne . .	2	6,866	2	11,085	—	2,727	—	5,271
18. Nottingham	—	4,376	2	8,277	2	4,933	—	5,314
19. Oldham	2	6,131	2	10,520	—	6,100	—	8,788
20. Salford	—	6,080	2	11,113	2	6,247	—	8,351
21. Sheffield	2	18,288	1	16,862	—	5,272	1	16,546
22. Southwark	2	5,968	2	9,607	—	2,495	—	7,919
23. Surrey (E.)	2	4,052	—	5,953	—	3,553	2	8,010
24. Surrey (Mid)	—	3,125	—	5,749	2	4,450	2	8,389
25. Tower Hamlets . . .	2	13,869	1	13,754	—	7,446	1	11,720
26. Wednesbury	1	7,098	1	6,912	—	3,779	—	207
27. Westminster	1	6,434	—	6,504	1	7,648	2	9,012
28. Yorkshire (W. R., E. Division)	—	6,957	2	9,462	2	7,286	—	8,249
29. Yorkshire (W. R., S. Division)	2	8,027	2	11,283	—	7,761	—	10,206
Totals	45	287,224	43	365,770	17	172,518	19	290,966

In this case, by far the most important of all from a purely numerical point of view, the Tory percentage of the total voters has increased no less than 6·8, for while in 1868 it only amounted to 37·5, in 1880 it was as much as 44·3. The Liberal percentage of the total voters has correspondingly declined from 62·5 to 55·7. And on both occasions it is to be observed that, owing to the working of our present system of representation, the Tories obtained much less than their due share of members, for while in 1868 they had only 17, as against 45 Liberal members, while they were entitled to 23, as against only 39, in 1880 they had only 19, as against 43, Liberal members, while they were entitled to 27, as against only 35. Consequently in this class of constituencies, which is always represented as the most intelligent and far-seeing, though no doubt Liberal principles are still in the ascendant, they are so in a fast decreasing ratio as compared with a dozen years ago, and supposing the tendency to continue unchecked, the Tories may reasonably look forward at no distant time to obtaining the supremacy in these very large centres of electoral strength.

The following six constituencies—Bradford, Liverpool, Stoke-upon-Trent, Wolverhampton, Yorkshire (N. R.), Yorkshire (W. R., N. Div.)—also had electorates of over 17,500 in 1880, but were not contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880. On each occasion they returned 10 Liberals and 3 Tories.

Hence, taking the whole of the very large constituencies into account, we notice that while in 1868 the Liberals had as many as 55, and in 1880 as many as 53 members as their share of those returned by the thirty-five very large constituencies in England, and though in 1868 the Tories had only 20, and in 1880 only 22, members, yet that this excess of Liberal members by no means indicated a corresponding excess of Liberal feeling among the constituencies, but was due only to the defective working of our present system of representation. And, indeed, it is clear that it is among these very large constituencies that there lies the prospect of the Tories gaining ground in the future, and it is this that marks a most important feature of the political outlook.

Let us now bring into one view the results at which we have arrived in detail. We shall then obtain the following—

SUMMARY.

	LIBERAL.				TORY.			
	1868.		1880.		1868.		1880.	
	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.	Mem- bers.	Voters.
Very small constituencies .	13	14,184	17	16,518	24	15,052	20	17,343
Small constituencies . . .	86	112,626	88	147,069	41	105,411	39	128,539
Moderate-sized constituencies	24	96,000	31	124,266	34	100,350	27	113,658
Large constituencies	5	43,193	11	60,956	15	46,532	9	56,797
Very large constituencies	45	287,224	43	365,770	17	172,518	19	290,966
Totals	173	553,227	190	714,579	131	439,863	114	607,303

The first noticeable fact is, that while the Liberal voters have increased 29 per cent. between 1868 and 1880, the Tory voters have increased no less than 38 per cent. in the same interval. Hence it is clear that Tory principles are increasing in a greater ratio than Liberal principles; and, indeed, we find that, taking a comprehensive view of the whole of the constituencies which were contested by Liberals and Tories in both 1868 and 1880, the percentage of Tory voters has increased from 44·3 to 45·9, and that this growth is due entirely to the rapid advance of Tory principles among the very large constituencies; for in the very small, the small, the moderate-sized, and the large constituencies, Liberal principles have made the more rapid relative advance. And, conversely, the percentage of Liberal voters has decreased from 55·7 to 54·1, and the decline of Liberal principles has been entirely in the very large constituencies, which Radicals have always claimed as strongholds, but which, as a matter of fact, seem likely to be the ground in which the Tories will henceforth make the greatest advance, and owing to the existence of which it arises that we are able to give an affirmative reply to the question with which we started. And though the relatively smaller number of Liberal voters has returned an absolutely greater number of Liberal members, the consequent falling off in the number of the Tory members is not due in any way to a decline of Tory principles, but solely to the erratic working of our system of representation, which, on the next occasion, is more than likely to err in the reverse direction, and to give the Tories not only their legitimate increase, but also an artificial one. Indeed, as a matter of fact, in 1868, instead of there having been 173 Liberal members to 131 Tory members, there should have been only 169 Liberal members as compared with 135 Tory members; while in 1880, instead of there having been 190 Liberal members to 114 Tory members, there should have been only 164 Liberal members to as many as 140 Tory members. We may thus assert unhesitatingly that Conservatism has increased in England since the last Reform Bill.

ALFRED FRISBY.

THE BERGSTURZ AT ELM.

THE event called in German Switzerland a *Bergsturz*, where a portion of a steep mountain-side precipitates itself down, sometimes through thousands of feet, into a plain or valley below, has no parallel in countries such as ours. We have indeed no proper name for it; for our term *landslip*, referring to the gentle movements of earth known in the Isle of Wight and some other British localities, fails to give any adequate idea of the terrible violence of the Swiss occurrence. For this reason I retain the original expressive compound word; for even the rendering *mountain-fall* would be too tame, as the verb *stürzen* means far more than mere motion downwards; it adds the idea of enormous energy, which no simple English word seems adequate to convey.

Events of the nature referred to are naturally to be looked for in countries where deep valleys with precipitous sides have been excavated in rocky material; for such material is seldom so solid and compact as to be free from liability to fall to pieces, especially when subject to the action of the weather. It is a curious instance of this that it has been found necessary to line the great railway rock-tunnels of Mont Cenis and St. Gothard almost entirely with substantial masonry. In travelling through Swiss valleys we find abundant evidence of falls from the sides that have taken place at former times, and such falls are known to continue in the present day. It is, however, but seldom that they are of sufficient magnitude to do much mischief and become historical. The greatest on record, whether estimated by its actual dimensions or by the extent of the damage it caused, was that of Goldau, on the 2nd September, 1806. Here an enormous mass forming the upper portion of the Rossberg, a high mountain north of the Rigi, suddenly gave way and dashed into the fertile and populous valley below, destroying several villages, half filling up a lake, and entombing 457 human beings in a horrible grave.

A calamity of the same nature has lately occurred in the Canton of Glarus, and although of smaller extent than the Goldau fall, it has been very destructive to life and property. A notice of it, founded on a visit I paid to the spot a few weeks afterwards, may possibly be interesting to the readers of this magazine.

Among the crowds of tourists who travel, every autumn, from Zurich on their way to Chur and the Engadine, many will have noticed a lateral valley which opens on the western end of Lake Wallenstadt, and penetrates in a southerly direction among very high lands. This valley is watered by the Linth, a river notable as evidencing one of the greatest triumphs of science over natural

disadvantages. It was at one time the scourge of the whole valley, which its floods laid under periodical devastation; but, thanks to the skill and energy of one man, a local engineer, it has not only been entirely cured of its mischievous propensities, but has been forced to become a valuable servant to the district, by furnishing an ample store of well-regulated water power to a host of busy and prosperous industries. And it is curious that the Swiss nation, in spite of their democratic prepossessions, have conferred on their benefactor a patent of nobility, honourable alike to him and to them. "Escher von der Linth" carries in his title at once an explanation and a justification of his well-earned fame.

The valley of the Linth is singularly picturesque. It has its origin in the high snowy group of which the Tödi (nearly 12,000 feet) is the culminating peak, and throughout its course, particularly near the well-frequented baths of Stachelberg and the bustling little town of Glarus, it presents mountain scenery unsurpassed in beauty. At Schwanden, about three miles above Glarus, the Linth is joined, on the east side, by a tributary called the Sernf. The valley that brings this down rises sharply from the junction and bends to the southward, finally losing itself against the immense mountain ridge that forms the northern wall of the great Romansch Valley of the Vorder Rhein, and separates the Glarus district from the Canton of the Grisons. There is a good carriage road up the Sernfthal, passing through the villages of Engi, Matt, and Schwandi, and terminating, about nine miles from the Linth, at the chief place, Elm, the site of the catastrophe now to be described.

Elm lies at a height of 3,230 feet above the sea. In its remote position it is little visited by pleasure tourists, but it is known to climbers as the meeting point of several high passes. One of these has an historic celebrity, being the scene of the disastrous retreat of Suwarrow and his band before the victorious French army in October, 1799. The house in Elm where the defeated Russian hero took up his quarters is still shown, and the traditions of his appearance and behaviour yet survive.

All visitors to the locality are shown a natural curiosity called the *Martinsloch*, a small hole in one of the peaks high up above the snows to the south-eastward, through which the sun shines down on the village at a certain morning hour twice a year. The Elmers are proud of this, and it is a standing joke against them that, at the time of the introduction of the New Style, they stiff-neckedly objected for a long time to its adoption, lest it should interfere with the regularity of the solar movement, and deprive them of their long-cherished morning beam!

The inhabitants of the village numbered, according to the last census, something over a thousand. They and the dwellers in the valley generally are a strong, hardy, and handsome race, particularly

in the male sex; they are industrious, home-loving, proud of their good name, and renowned for their uprightness of principle and conduct, for which reason capitalists have always been ready to invest money in their undertakings. The surplus population have frequently emigrated to America, not as paupers, but as well-to-do settlers, and a flourishing colony, called "New Elm," has been founded by them in Wisconsin. The education of the young is well cared for, and appears to extend to some accomplishments, as the people are famed for their singing of a rude kind of *Volkslieder*. A verse of one of these songs runs thus:—

" Bis die Berge thun sich büge
Und die Hügel senke sich
Bis der Tod mir nimmt das Lebe,
So lang will i liebe Dich ! "

The merry parties singing this have little thought what a mournful event they were anticipating; but the idea expressed, and the fact that one of the neighbouring hills is called the "Mörderhorn," would seem to imply, a long-existing dread of some danger of the kind.

Elm may be considered to stand at the head of the valley, and it is closely overshadowed by the great mountain-wall already mentioned, which towers up to a height of some 6,000 feet above it, in an unbroken ridge, covered in many parts with glaciers, and with that peculiar formation of half-consolidated snow which is called in German *Firn*. The catastrophe originated in a spur of this wall, called the *Tschingelberg*, and lying about three-quarters of a mile to the south-east of the village. It consists of a bluff promontory rising very steeply, almost precipitously, out of the valley bottom, for a height of about 2,000 feet, and having above it more moderate slopes forming the "Tschingel Alp," these again rising to the great ridge above.

The Tschingelberg was of great interest to the Elmers on account of the important slate quarries that had been formed therein. Strata of this useful material had been found and profitably worked in many parts of the valley, particularly near Matt, and the Commune of Elm took advantage of a similar formation existing in the lower portion of the Tschingel promontory. The exploitation of these quarries had much increased of late years, and the produce of the "Plattenberg," as this part of the hill was called, had formed the chief revenue of the Commune. About three years ago a company offered a royalty of 10,000 francs a year for a lease of the quarries for twenty years; but the offer was at once refused, and with reason, as the income in 1880 turned out to be 70,000 francs. The slates from this source were chiefly used for forming large slabs, and the workings involved large excavations into the heart of the mountain.

Close under the Tschingelberg is a small side valley called the

Unterthal, very narrow, and bounded on the opposite side by a hill called the *Düneberg*. In the *Unterthal* was a small hamlet, principally devoted to the slate trade, and connected to the main-road near Elm by a short branch-road, crossing the *Sernf* by a light iron lattice bridge. Many houses and other buildings also existed along this road, and otherwise scattered about in the space between *Unterthal* and Elm.

The *Tschingelberg*, above the quarries, although largely covered with pine forests, and presenting no more dangerous appearance than is customary with steep rocks generally, had been long known to be in a somewhat loose condition, and falls of stones from it occasionally occurred. The hot and dry summer of 1881 was succeeded by heavy rains which, penetrating into the cracks and fissures, made matters worse, and the dislodgments became more frequent. Some alarm was created, and on Friday, the 9th of September, an examination was made by competent persons deputed for the purpose by the Commune. The result was a recommendation that some protective measures should be undertaken, but no immediate danger was apprehended.

During Sunday, the 11th, rain fell in torrents, and in the afternoon the falls of stones became so much increased as to attract anxious attention upwards to the hill. A little after 5 P.M. some observers saw the fir-trees, on a patch of ground high up above the quarries, begin to move, and to bend, as they said, "like stalks of corn before the sickle of the reaper." It was now clear that some greater fall was imminent, and shortly afterwards, at about half-past five, a large mass of rock fell with a fearful crash into the *Unterthal*, shattering several buildings in its way. Then arose a great cry, exhortations to *flüchten* (fly) and *plündern* (remove your goods) being heard in all directions. Able and active men heroically rushed to relieve those who were in danger; but, alas! before anything could be done, all help was rendered unavailing. A quarter of an hour after the first fall occurred a second, which completed the destruction of the *Unterthal*, and then immediately followed the third and most frightful of all. The whole side of the mountain gave way, and dashed into the valley below, accompanied by a roar as of a thousand thunders, and enveloping the whole neighbourhood in a thick opaque cloud of dust, producing a darkness deeper than the blackest night.

When towards seven o'clock the atmosphere had somewhat cleared, the fearful devastation became visible. Providentially the greater part of the village of Elm had escaped, but everything between that and *Unterthal*, fields, crops, houses, and everything in them, had disappeared, buried under thousands of tons of shattered rock and stone. It was then getting dusk, and, as the night closed in, blank despair spread around, for it was evident that there was no hope of

rescue. This was confirmed in the morning when offers of help poured in from all the neighbourhood. A few horribly mutilated corpses were found in some ruined buildings visible at the exterior of the mass, but this was all. Some energetic attempts were made to remove the débris in places where it was thought houses might be reached, but they were altogether without success, and the efforts were soon discontinued. Only one person was rescued alive; this was an old man of ninety-two years of age, who was found among some ruins with no other hurt than a bruise on one foot. The wound was immaterial, but he died from the nervous shock a few weeks afterwards.

When, in a few days, the statistics came to be inquired into, it was made out that the falling mass had overwhelmed 22 dwelling-houses, 50 stables, 12 stores and workshops, and, saddest of all, 114 inhabitants of the valley. It was sad, too, to learn that the heroic men who had, on the first approach of danger, hastened to help their friends and neighbours, had all perished in the noble act—not one of them was heard of more.

Some touching incidents that occurred during the catastrophe are described by a Zurich observer who visited the spot forty hours afterwards.¹ He says—

“When I arrived at the village, women were weeping at their house doors, in a state of the bitterest anguish: they answered my questions in sobs and broken sentences, as if their breath failed them in their feeling of horror.

“I saw, lying at the foot of a tree, a pretty little box that had been picked up among the dirt; there was an inscription on the lid, ‘A new year’s gift from Johannes Reiner to his dear goddaughter, Katherina Reiner, 1855,’ and in it were found an embroidered neckerchief and some other fancy articles of female apparel. The inscription reminded me of a person of the same surname, Burckhardt Reiner, a strong, upright man of seventy, with whom I had been speaking shortly before. I asked him if he had relatives among the lost ones, and he told me his sorrow. He lived on the hillside, out of danger, but his son, with a wife and two children, dwelt in a house a short distance away, on the Elm road. Burckhardt’s daughter had gone on the Sunday afternoon to see her brother and his family. When the first alarm was heard at Unterthal, the old man’s wife ran to her son’s house to urge them all to come away with her; not that any real danger was feared at that great distance, but from a natural desire to get all her family together when trouble was near. But before they could leave the house, the great mass came down and involved the mother, daughter, son, son’s wife, and grandchildren, in one common destruction; ‘and now,’ said the old man, weeping like a child, ‘I am alone in the world.’ ‘Ach weun ich doch nur noch Eines hätte! ach nur die Tochter! die Tochter noch, sie ist so gueti gsi (so gut gewesen)!’ I pressed the old man’s hand and went sadly on my way.

“Outside a house in Schwandi I saw, sitting on the bench, a pale, sad woman, Elsbeth, the sister of the Hausfrau; she had two girls, of about six and nine years old respectively, clinging to her. She lived in Unterthal, and on the first alarm she took her two children, the girls who were with her, by the hand, and dragged them, she says, with almost superhuman force, up the steep hill

(1) *Der Bergsturz von Elm*. Von. J. Hardmeyer-Jenny. Zurich, Füssli, 1881. I am indebted to this little brochure for many of the particulars here given.

for safety. She called to her father and mother-in-law, and an old uncle, who were living with her, for God's sake to follow; the three old people obeyed, but they had not her strength, and Elsbeth lost sight of them. She herself, after she had got a little higher, lay down exhausted with the girls in a rock crevice. She had not been there many moments when the great earth torrent came thundering by, enveloping her in darkness, but fortunately leaving her unharmed. The old people had been overtaken by it, as had also her husband, who, like Lot's wife, had lingered too long after his possessions, and had paid the sad penalty."

A cattle-dealer named Matthias Rhyner lost his wife, a woman highly esteemed for her benevolence, together with three daughters and two sons, all notably gifted and handsome. On the Sunday evening he was away on the mountain, but on hearing the crash he hastened down, only to find that even the site of his once happy home was no longer distinguishable. In his agony he could not free himself from the idea that his loved ones must be still alive, calling for help beneath the ruins. In pity for him some kind friends undertook to dig among the rock heaps; the work was continued for days, but although, of course, all efforts were in vain, it was long before the sad illusion could be dispelled.

In a solitary chalet, high up on the Dünceberg, lived an old man, Christopher Elmer, with his wife and son. The two men were amongst those who rushed to the help of their friends; they never returned, and the old wife remains in her chalet still, more solitary than ever.

A respected inhabitant, Matthew Rigg, lately married, had had his first child baptized on the Sunday morning, and held, as is usual, a family festival in the afternoon. It was attended by several guests, among whom were the wife's sister, named Beglinger, with her husband and four children, from Matt. When the alarm came some of those present escaped, but the poor mother and her baby perished, and Beglinger had to return sorrowing home accompanied only by two of his children, leaving his wife and the other two dead among the ruins. It was indeed a sad christening.

In one family, only a little girl remained alive out of a large household; in another, a little boy is the only survivor. At the temporary telegraph office erected at Schwandi, arrived many messages of inquiry addressed by relatives and friends at a distance to those whom no message would reach more in this world.

The funeral, if such a name could be given to the interment of the few mangled remains that had been collected, took place on the 14th September, when thirteen coffins, eleven adults' and two children's size, were deposited in consecrated ground. There was a large concourse of mourners, and appropriate addresses were delivered by two of the local clergy.

As soon as the most pressing care for human life was past, it was seen that serious evils were threatened by the interference of the fall

with the natural flow of the land drainage. The rubbish had obliterated the former courses of the rivers, and the hill and glacier streams, swollen into torrents by the rains, began to collect in dangerous accumulations, or to wander wildly over the country, causing further destruction of property; this therefore called for immediate attention, and the help offered was devoted energetically as the first object to open suitable drainage channels.

The general distress was aggravated by alarm as to the possible continuance of danger. For some time afterwards stones continued to fall, and there was reason to believe that wide fissures had been formed, and large masses rendered insecure by the loss of support. Warnings were circulated, and in the night between Monday and Tuesday the remaining portion of the village was almost entirely deserted; but as the mountain appeared quiet, courage was restored, and at the time of my visit nearly all the houses were occupied as usual. But the Government of the Canton thought it advisable to institute a definite inquiry on the matter, and they commissioned Professor Heim, of Zurich, a distinguished engineer and geologist, to examine the mountain. His report, lately presented, is by no means reassuring. He says there appears danger in three several spots adjoining the great scar already existing on the hill; and that some of these threaten the remainder of the village. No precautions, he says, are possible to prevent the falls, and he therefore recommends the inhabitants to leave their houses till the danger is past. But this they are reluctant to do, and the only alternative is constant watching, sentinels being accordingly posted to give warning by day or night of the appearance of danger, so that the people may flee in time.

It may be well now to give some idea by actual figures of the magnitude of the Bergsturz. The greatest height of the fall, *i.e.* the height from the valley to the top of the fracture, was about 2,000 feet. The quantity of material that fell is estimated at about 360,000,000 cubic feet, or say 20,000,000 tons, and it is believed that half this came from the upper part of the hill. When it is considered that the velocity due to a fall of 2,000 feet is about 350 feet a second, some idea may be formed of the tremendous amount of mechanical force expended on the shock.

The effect of this force was manifested in various ways. First by the smashing up of the *débris*. There are, no doubt, some very large pieces lying about; one of the biggest measuring about 50 feet by 40 feet by 25 feet—or 50,000 cubic feet. But the great mass is broken up into comparatively small fragments, and a large proportion was pulverised into fine dust, which, as in the eruptions of Vesuvius, spread over the neighbourhood for miles around. Then, the behaviour of the falling material gave singular evidence of the force inherent in it. A large portion crossed the Unterthal (a horizontal distance from its original site of about half a mile), struck the

opposite hill of the Dünberg, and mounted up it to a height of some 350 feet, at the same time rushing up the rising slope of the valley to the eastward. But the great mass fell in the open valley and followed the natural fall towards Elm, rolling with prodigious impetus down the slope, and at the same time spreading out laterally. It covered a surface of ground equal to about one square kilomètre, and lay thereon in some places as much as 100 feet deep. The rocky stream extended westwards to a distance of a mile and a quarter from its origin, reaching and carrying away a part of the main road leading to Elm. It was here that some of the most valuable lives and property were destroyed; for as the village had been increasing in population and wealth, a new suburb of good houses had been built along this road, and they were all either buried in the mass or upset and crushed to pieces by the shock. Some isolated ruins of them were visible near the edge of the débris when I visited the spot, smashed-up joinery, household utensils, and furniture lying scattered about among the rocks and mud. It was here that the human remains were principally found.

The feature that most impressed me was the great similarity of the behaviour of the mass to that of a stream of mud or other semi-fluid substances, and it required some mental effort to convince one's self that the whole was formed of angular rocky fragments. This again shows the tremendous *vis viva* of the great mass, which, notwithstanding the immense frictional resistance of its elementary components, caused it to follow to a certain extent the laws of fluid motion.

I remember, having frequently had occasion to pass over the field of the Goldau Bergsturz, remarking also there evidences of enormous force, but manifested in a different way; the rock of the Rossberg, a hard conglomerate, offered much more resistance to breaking up, and consequently the force was expended more in tossing the huge fragments about. When one looks at the colossal blocks, almost mountains in themselves, which lie scattered over the wide valley, one can hardly believe they have been projected from the rift in the hillside miles away.

One remarkable feature of these mountain falls is the great disturbance of the air caused by the swift motion through it of such an immense bulk of material. In this instance, it was remarked by some near observers who had the good fortune to escape, that immediately after the giving way of the great mass, but before it reached the lower ground, a tremendous blast of wind drove down the valley. It completely carried away the iron bridge, about twelve tons weight, over the branch road to Unterthal, and deposited it, crumpled to pieces, at some distance. It is known also that some persons who had collected on this spot (thinking themselves safe such a way off) were whirled into the air by the hurricane and killed.

Among these was a local judge, proprietor of the principal inn, and a man much esteemed in all the country round.

It is interesting in a scientific point of view to inquire if any cause of a geological nature can be assigned for the rupture of the mountain. In the Goldau case a distinct geological origin could be traced for the disaster, namely the superposition of stony beds on inclined strata impervious to water, which under certain conditions formed a slippery surface on which the upper beds could slide down. This kind of stratification is very visible in many parts of the neighbouring hills, particularly on the Righi, where slips are not unfrequent. One of some magnitude that occurred two years ago is visible from the Kaltbad Railway Station. I cannot learn, however, that any similar cause was present in the Elm case. The rock is marked in Studer and Escher's geological map as *Terrain nummulitique*, belonging to the tertiary Eocene formation; and although it consisted of a mixture of two constituents, limestone and slate, these do not appear to have lain in any such relative positions as to favour the fall. It is more probable that the cause was the very simple and ordinary one which produces falls in general, namely a loose, fissured state of the rock generally, which was aggravated by the plentiful flow of water through its crevices, and the consequent further erosion of the mass, till it lost the coherence necessary to maintain it in its highly inclined position.

Then the question arises whether the working of the slate quarries had any share in the matter? It is natural that under the painful circumstances, this question should have been dealt with very tenderly; but as a matter of science one can hardly think it likely that large excavations could be made in the side of a steep hill of this character without danger. But it is an ill wind that blows nobody good, and as it appears that the public attention has been directed to other workings of a similar character in the neighbourhood, it is to be hoped that the warning, though a fearful one, may not be without its utility.

It is difficult to form a money estimate of the damage done. Independently of the property in buildings, furniture, &c., a large area of very precious land in the valley and on the hillsides has been utterly and permanently ruined, and a great quantity of valuable timber destroyed. A sum of about one and a quarter million of francs, or £50,000, has been named, but this cannot include the annihilation of the slate quarries, which, bringing in about £2,800 a year, would of themselves represent a very large value utterly lost to the Commune. To mitigate the serious private losses, subscriptions were opened throughout Switzerland, free reference being made to the old adage of the Confederation, *Einer für Alle, und Alle für Einen*; and it is pleasant to know that these appeals have been liberally responded to.

WILLIAM POLE.

THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION.¹

ALTHOUGH it is generally recognised that the *Origin of Species* has produced an effect both on the science and the philosophy of our age which is without a parallel in the history of thought, admirers of Mr. Darwin's genius are frequently surprised at the ignorance of his work which is displayed by many persons who can scarcely be said to belong to the uncultured classes. The reason of this ignorance is no doubt partly due to the busy life which many of our bread-winners are constrained to live; but it is also, I think, partly due to mere indolence. There are thousands of educated persons who, on coming home from their daily work, prefer reading literature of a less scientific character than that which is supplied by Mr. Darwin's works; and therefore it is that such persons feel these works to belong to a category of books which is to them a very large one—the books, namely, which never are, but always to be, read. Under these circumstances I have thought it desirable to supply a short digest of the *Origin of Species*, which any man, of however busy a life or of however indolent a disposition, may find both time and energy to follow.

With the general aim of the present abstract being thus understood, I shall start at the beginning of my subject by very briefly describing the theory of Natural Selection. It is a matter of observable fact that all plants and animals are perpetually engaged in what Mr. Darwin calls a "struggle for existence." That is to say, in every generation of every species a great many more individuals are born than can possibly survive; so that there is in consequence a perpetual battle for life going on among all the constituent indi-

(1) The following paper was written several years ago for a purpose other than that of appearing in a Review. Although, as a consequence, its style is better adapted to oral delivery than to publication in a periodical, I now print it without alteration because I think that it serves to place in a tolerably clear light the bearing of Darwinism on the doctrine of design. This is a subject which, during the last few weeks, the Duke of Argyll and myself have been discussing in the pages of *Nature*; and, as our views with regard to it are divergent, I have thought it opportune now to publish this essay, in order to render my statement of the case somewhat more complete. It is desirable to explain only that in placing Intelligent Design in antithesis to Natural Selection, I throughout refer to design in the sense understood by the older forms of teleology—i.e. as an *immediate* cause of the phenomena in question. Whether or not there is an *ultimate* design pervading all nature—a *causa causarum* which is the final *raison d'être* of the cosmos—this is another question, and one which I take to have no point of legitimate contact with natural science. My only contention is that, if the doctrine of evolution is accepted, and the causes which it sets forth are held adequate to furnish a scientific explanation of the results observed, then the facts of organic nature necessarily fall into the same logical position, with reference to any question of teleology, as that of all or any other series of facts in the physical universe.

viduals of any given generation. Now in this struggle for existence, which individuals will be victorious and live? Assuredly those which are best fitted to live: the weakest and the least fitted to live will succumb and die, while the strongest and the best fitted to live will be triumphant and survive. It is this "survival of the fittest" that Mr. Darwin calls "Natural Selection;" Nature, so to speak, *selects* the best individuals out of each generation to live. And not only so, but as these favoured individuals transmit their favourable qualities to their offspring, according to the fixed laws of heredity, it follows that the individuals composing each successive generation have a general tendency to be better suited to their surroundings than were their forefathers. And this follows, not merely because in every generation it is only the flower of the race that is allowed to propagate, but also because, if in any generation some new and beneficial qualities happen to appear as slight variations from the ancestral type, these will be seized upon by Natural Selection and added, by transmission in subsequent generations, to the previously existing type. Thus the best idea of the whole process will be gained by comparing it with the closely analogous process whereby gardeners and cattle-breeders create their wonderful productions; for just as these men, by always selecting their best individuals to breed from, slowly but continuously improve their stock, so Nature, by a similar process of selection, slowly but continuously makes the various species of plants and animals better and better suited to the conditions of their life.

Now, if this process of continuously adapting organisms to their environment takes place in Nature at all, there is no reason why we should set any limits on the extent to which it is able to go, up to the point at which a complete and perfect adaptation is achieved. Therefore we might suppose that all species would attain to this condition of perfect adjustment to their environment and then remain fixed. And so undoubtedly they would, were the environment itself unchanging. But forasmuch as the environment—or the sum total of the external conditions of life—of almost every organic type alters more or less from century to century (whether from astronomical, geological, and geographical changes, or from the immigrations and emigrations of other species living on contiguous geographical areas), it follows that the process of Natural Selection need never reach a terminal phase. And forasmuch as Natural Selection may thus continue, *ad infinitum*, slowly to alter a specific type in adaptation to a gradually changing environment, if in any case the alteration thus effected is sufficient in amount to lead naturalists to denote the specific type by some different name, it follows that Natural Selection has transmuted one specific type into another. And thus the process is supposed to go on over all the countless

species of plants and animals simultaneously—the world of organic types being thus regarded as in a state of perpetual, though gradual, flux.

Such, then, is the theory of Natural Selection; and the first thing to be observed with regard to it is, that it offers to our acceptance a scientific explanation of the numberless cases of apparent Design which we everywhere meet with in Organic Nature. For as all these cases of apparent Design consist only in the *adaptation* which is shown by organisms to their environment, it is obvious that the facts are covered by the theory of Natural Selection no less completely than they are covered by the theory of Intelligent Design. Perhaps it may be answered, “The fact that these innumerable cases of adaptation may be accounted for by Natural Selection, is no proof that they are not really due to Intelligent Design.” This is an objection which is often urged by minds—even highly cultured minds—which have not been accustomed to scientific modes of thought. Thus, a celebrated Professor of Divinity once wrote me in a letter that, although he had read Darwin’s books with care, he could see no evidence of Natural Selection which might not equally well be adduced as evidence of Intelligent Design; and I have heard another eminent Professor tell his class that the many instances of adaptation which Mr. Darwin discovered and described as occurring in orchids seemed to him to tell more in favour of contrivance than in favour of natural causes. Now I do not hesitate to say that we have here a very prostitution of our rational faculty. It positively takes one’s breath away to imagine the state of mind to which these men must have been reduced by their life-long adherence to traditional modes of thought. For, be it observed, they do not doubt that Natural Selection *may* be able to do all that Darwin attributes to it; they merely object to Darwin’s interpretation of the facts, because they assert that these facts might *equally well* be attributed to Intelligent Design. And so undoubtedly they might, if we were all childish enough to rush into a supernatural explanation whenever a natural explanation is found sufficient to account for the facts. Once admit the glaringly illogical principle that we may assume the operation of higher causes where the operation of lower ones is sufficient to explain the observed phenomena, and all our science and all our philosophy are scattered to the winds. For the Law of Logic which Sir William Hamilton called the Law of Parsimony—or the law which forbids us to assume the operation of higher causes when lower ones are found sufficient to explain the observed effects—this law constitutes the only logical barrier between Science and Superstition. For it is manifest that it is always possible to give a hypothetical explanation of any phenomenon whatsoever, by referring it immediately to the intelligence of some supernatural agent; so that

the only difference between the logic of Science and the logic of Superstition consists in Science recognising a validity in the Law of Parsimony which Superstition disregards. Therefore I have no hesitation in saying that this way of looking at the evidence in favour of Natural Selection is not a scientific or a reasonable way of looking at it, but a purely superstitious way. Let us take, for instance, as an illustration, a perfectly parallel case. When Kepler was unable to explain by any known causes the paths described by the planets, he resorted to a supernatural explanation, and supposed that every planet was guided in its movements by some presiding angel. But when Newton supplied a beautifully simple physical explanation, all persons with a scientific habit of mind at once abandoned the metaphysical explanation. Now, to be consistent, the Divinity Professors, and all who think with them, ought still to adhere to Kepler's hypothesis in preference to Newton's explanation; for, excepting the Law of Parsimony, there is certainly no other logical objection to the statement that the movements of the planets afford as good evidence of the influence of guiding angels as they do of the influence of gravitation.

So much, then, for the absurdly illogical position that, granting the evidence in favour of Natural Selection and Supernatural Design to be equal and parallel, we should hesitate for one moment in our choice. But now it may properly be asked, What is your evidence in favour of Natural Selection? Well, the evidence in favour of Natural Selection as a cause is simply the evidence in favour of Organic Evolution as an effect. Let us state the problem clearly. Innumerable cases of adaptation of organisms to their environment are the observed facts for which an explanation is required. To supply this explanation, two, and only two, hypotheses are in the field. Of these two hypotheses one is, Intelligent Design manifested in creation; and the other is, Natural Selection manifested during the countless ages of the past. Now it would be proof positive of Intelligent Design if it could be shown that all species of plants and animals were *created*—that is, *suddenly* introduced into the complex conditions of their life; for it is quite inconceivable that any cause other than intelligence could be competent to adapt an organism to its environment *suddenly*. On the other hand, it would be proof-presumptive of Natural Selection if it could be shown that one species becomes slowly transmuted into another—*i.e.*, that one set of adaptations may be gradually transformed into another set of adaptations according as changing circumstances require. This would be proof-presumptive of Natural Selection, because it would then become amply probable that Natural Selection might have brought about many, or most, of the cases of adaptations which we see; and, if so, the Law of Parsimony excludes the rival hypothesis of Intelli-

gent Design. Thus the whole question as between Natural Selection and Supernatural Design resolves itself into this—Were all the species of plants and animals separately created, or were they slowly evolved? For if they were specially created, the evidence of Supernatural Design remains unrefuted and irrefutable; whereas if they were slowly evolved, that evidence has been utterly and for ever destroyed. The doctrine of Natural Selection therefore depends for its validity on the doctrine of Organic Evolution; for if once the fact of Organic Evolution were established, no one would dispute that much of the adaptation was probably effected by Natural Selection. *How* much we cannot say—probably never shall be able to say; for even Mr. Darwin himself does not doubt that other causes besides that of Natural Selection have assisted in the modifying of specific types. For the sake of simplicity, however, I shall not go into this subject; but shall always speak of Natural Selection as the only cause of Organic Evolution. Let us, then, weigh the evidence in favour of Organic Evolution. If we find it wanting, we need have no complaints to make of natural theologians of to-day; but if we find it to be full measure, shaken together and running over, we ought to maintain that natural theologians can no longer adhere to the arguments of such writers as Paley, Bell, and Chalmers, without deliberately violating the only logical principle which separates Science from Fetishism.

I shall first take the argument from Classification. Naturalists find that all species of plants and animals present among themselves structural affinities. According as these structural affinities are more or less pronounced, the various species are classified under genera, orders, families, classes, sub-kingdoms, and kingdoms. Now in such a classification it is found impossible to place all the species in a linear series, according to the grade of their organization. For instance, we cannot say that a wolf is more highly organized than a fox or a jackal; we can only say that the specific points wherein it differs from these animals are without significance as proving the one type to be more highly organized than the others. But of course in many cases, and especially in the cases of the larger divisions, it is often possible to say—The members in this division are more highly organized than are the members in that division. Our system of classification therefore may be likened to a tree, in which a short trunk may be taken to represent the lowest organisms which cannot properly be termed either plants or animals. This short trunk soon separates into two large trunks, one of which represents the vegetable and the other the animal kingdom. Each of these trunks then gives off large branches signifying classes, and these give off smaller, but more numerous branches, signifying families,

which ramify again into orders, genera, and finally into the leaves, which may be taken to represent species.

Now in such a representative tree of life the height of any branch from the ground may be taken to indicate the grade of organization which the leaves, or species, present; so that if we picture to ourselves such a tree, we shall understand that while there is a general advance of organization from below upwards, there are numberless slight variations in this respect between leaves growing even on the same branch; while in a still greater number of cases leaves growing on the same branch are growing on the same level—that is, although they represent different species, it cannot be said that one is more highly organized than the other. Now this tree-like arrangement of specific organisms in Nature is an arrangement for which Darwin is not responsible. I mean that the framing of this natural classification has been the work of naturalists for centuries past; and although they did not know what they were doing, it is now evident to evolutionists that they were tracing the lines of genetic relationship. For, be it observed, scientific or natural classification differs very much from a popular or haphazard classification, and the difference consists in this—that while a popular classification is framed with exclusive reference to the external appearance of organisms, a scientific classification is made with reference to the whole structure. A whale, for instance, is often thought to be a fish, because it resembles a fish in form and habits; whereas dissection shows that it is beyond all comparison more unlike a fish than it is like a horse or a man. This is, of course, an extreme case; but it was cases such as this that first led naturalists to see that there are resemblances between organisms much more deep and important than appear upon the surface, and consequently that if a natural classification was possible at all, it must be made with reference to these deeper resemblances. Of course it took time to perceive this distinction between fundamental and superficial resemblances. I remember once reading a very comical disquisition in one of Buffon's works on the question as to whether or not a crocodile was to be classified as an insect; and the instructive feature in the disquisition was this—that although a crocodile differs from an insect as regards every conceivable particular of its internal anatomy, no allusion at all is made to this fact, while the whole discussion is made to turn on the hardness of the external casing of a crocodile resembling the hardness of the external casing of a beetle; and when at last Buffon decides that, on the whole, a crocodile had better not be classified as an insect, the only reason given is, that as a crocodile is so very large an animal, it would make "altogether too terrible an insect."

But now, when at last it came to be recognised that internal anatomy rather than external appearance was to be taken as a guide

to classification, the question arose—What features in the internal anatomy are to take precedence over the other features? And this question it was not hard to answer. A porpoise, for instance, has a large number of teeth, and in this feature resembles most fish, while it differs from all mammals. But it also gives suck to its young, and in this feature it differs from all fish, while it resembles all mammals. Now, looking to those two features alone, should we say that a porpoise ought to be classed as a fish or as a mammal? Assuredly as a mammal, and for this reason: The number of teeth is a very variable feature both in fish and in mammals, whereas the giving of suck is an invariable feature among mammals, and occurs nowhere else in the animal kingdom. This, of course, is purposely chosen as a very simple illustration; but it exemplifies the general fact that the guiding principle of scientific classification is the comparing of organism with organism, with the view of seeing which of the constituent organs are of the most invariable occurrence, and therefore of the most typical signification.

Now, since the days of Linnaeus this principle has been carefully followed, and it is by its aid that the tree-like system of classification has been established. No one, even long before Darwin's days, ever dreamed of doubting that this system is in reality, what it always has been in name, a *natural* system. What, then, is the inference we are to draw from it? An evolutionist answers, that it is just such a system as his theory of descent would lead him to expect as a natural system. For this tree-like system is as clear an expression as anything could be of the fact that all species are bound together by the ties of genetic relationship. If all species were separately created, it is almost incredible that we should everywhere observe this progressive shading off of characters common to larger groups into more and more specialized characters distinctive only of smaller and smaller groups. At any rate, to say the least, the Law of Parsimony forbids us to ascribe such effects to a supernatural cause, acting in so whimsical a manner, when the effects are precisely what we should expect to follow from the action of a highly probable natural cause. The classification of animal forms, indeed, as Darwin, Lyell, and Hæckel have pointed out, strongly resembles the classification of languages. In the case of languages, as in the case of species, we have genetic affinities strongly marked; so that it is possible to some extent to construct a language-tree, the branches of which shall indicate, in a diagrammatic form, the progressive divergence of a large group of languages from a common stock. For instance, Latin may be regarded as a fossil language, which has given rise, by way of genetic descent, to a group of living languages—Italian, Spanish, French, and, to a large extent, English. Now what should we think of a philologist who should

maintain that English, French, Spanish, and Italian were all specially created, and that their resemblance to the fossil form Latin is to be attributed to supernatural design? Yet the evidence of the natural transmutation of species is in one respect much stronger than that of the natural transmutation of languages—in respect, namely, of there being a vastly greater number of cases all bearing testimony to the fact of genetic relationship.

I will now pass on to another line of argument—the argument from Morphology, or Structure. The theory of Evolution by Natural Selection supposes that hereditary characters admit of being slowly modified wherever their modification will render an organism better suited to a change in its conditions of life. Let us, then, observe the evidence we have of such adaptive modifications of structure, in cases where the need of such modification is apparent. For the sake of clearness I shall begin by again taking our old friends, the whales and porpoises. The theory of evolution infers, from the whole structure of these animals, that their progenitors must have been terrestrial quadrupeds of some kind, which became aquatic in their habits. Now the change in their condition of life thus brought about would render desirable great modifications of structure. These changes would in the first instance begin to affect the least typical—that is the least strongly inherited structures—such as the skin, claws, teeth, &c. But as time went on the adaptation would begin to extend to the more typical structures, until the shape of the body began to be affected by the bones and muscles required for terrestrial locomotion becoming better adapted for aquatic locomotion, so rendering the whole outline of the animal more fish-like in shape. This is the stage which we actually observe in the seal, where the hind legs, although retaining all their typical bones, have become shortened up almost to rudiments and directed backwards, so as to be of no use for walking, but serving to complete the fish-like taper of the body. But in the porpoise and whale group the modification has gone further than this, so that the hind legs have disappeared altogether, while the head has become fish-like in shape, and other profound changes have been established. But profound as these changes are, they only affect those parts of the organism which it was for the benefit of the organism to have altered, so that it might become adapted to an aquatic mode of existence. Thus the arm, which is used as a fin, still retains the bones of the shoulder, forearm, wrist, and fingers, although they are all enclosed in a fin-shaped sack, which renders them quite useless for any purpose other than swimming. Similarly the head, although it resembles the head of a fish in shape, still retains the bones of the mammalian skull, modified in form so as to offer the least possible amount of resistance to

the water. In short it may be said that all the modifications have been effected with the least possible divergence from the typical mammalian type, which is compatible with securing so perfect an adaptation to a purely aquatic mode of life.

Now I have chosen the case of the whale and porpoise group because they offer so extreme an example of profound modification of structure in adaptation to changed conditions of life. But the same thing may be seen in hundreds and hundreds of other cases. For instance, to confine our attention to the arm, not only is the limb modified in the whale for swimming, but in another mammal—the bat—it is modified for flying, by having the fingers enormously elongated and overspread with a membranous web. In birds, again, the arm is modified for flight in a wholly different way—the fingers here being very short and all run together, and the chief expanse of the wing being composed of the shoulder and fore-arm. In frogs and lizards again, we find hands more like our own; but in an extinct species of flying reptile the modification was extreme, the wing having been formed by a prodigious elongation of the fifth finger, and a membrane spread over it and the rest of the hand. Lastly, in serpents the hand and arm have disappeared altogether. Thus, even if we confine our attention to a single structure, how wonderful are the modifications which it is seen to undergo, although never losing its typical character! How are we to explain this? By design manifested in special creation, or by descent with adaptive modification? If it is said by design manifested in special creation, we must suppose that the Deity formed an archetypal plan of certain structures, and that He determined to adhere to this plan through all the modifications which those structures exhibit. Now the difficulties in the way of this supposition are prodigious, and to my mind quite insurmountable. In the first place, why is it that some structures are selected as typical and not others? Why should the vertebral skeleton, for instance, be tortured into every conceivable variety of modification in order to make it serviceable for as great a variety of functions; while another structure, such as the eye, is made in different sub-kingdoms on fundamentally different plans, notwithstanding that it has throughout to perform the same function? Will any one have the hardihood to assert that in the case of the skeleton the Deity has endeavoured to show His *ingenuity* by the manifold functions to which He has made the same structure subservient; while in the case of the eye He has endeavoured to show his *resources* by the manifold structures which He has to subserve the same function? If so, it appears to me a most unfortunate circumstance that throughout both the vegetable and animal kingdoms all cases which can be pointed to as showing ingenious adaptation of the same typical structure to the performance of widely different func-

tions, are cases which come within the limits of the same natural group of plants and animals, and therefore admit of being equally well explained by descent from a common ancestry; while all cases of widely different structures performing the same function are to be found in different groups of plants or animals, and are therefore suggestive of independent variations arising in the different lines of hereditary descent. To take a specific illustration. The octopus, or devil-fish, belongs to a widely different class of animals from a true fish, and yet its eye, in general appearance, looks wonderfully like the eye of a true fish. Now Mr. Mivart pointed to this fact as a great difficulty in the way of the theory of evolution by natural selection, because it must clearly be a most improbable thing that so complicated a structure as the eye of a fish should happen to be arrived at through each of two totally different lines of descent. And this difficulty would, indeed, be almost fatal to the theory of evolution by natural selection, if the apparent similarity were a real one. Unfortunately for the objection, however, Mr. Darwin clearly shows, in his reply, that in no one anatomical feature of typical importance do the two structures resemble one another; so that, in point of fact, the two organs do not resemble one another in any particular further than it is necessary that they should, if both are to serve as organs of sight. But now, suppose that this had not been the case, and that the two structures, besides presenting the necessary superficial resemblance, had also presented an anatomical resemblance. With what tremendous force might it have then been urged, "Your hypothesis of hereditary descent with progressive modification being here excluded by the fact that the animals compared belong to two widely different branches of the tree of life, how are we to explain the identity of type manifested by these two complicated organs of vision? The only hypothesis open to us is intelligent adherence to an ideal type." But as this cannot now be urged in any one case throughout the whole organic world, I will on the other hand present it as a most significant fact, that while within the limits of the same large branch of the tree of life we constantly find the same typical structures modified so as to perform very different functions, we never find any vestige of these particular types of structure in other large divisions of that tree. That is to say, we never find typical structures appearing except in cases where their presence may be explained by the theory of descent, while in thousands of such cases we find these structures undergoing every conceivable form of adaptive modification.

Consequently, special creationists must fall back upon another position and say, "Well, but it may have pleased the Deity to form a certain number of ideal types, and never to allow the structures occurring in the one type to appear in any of the others." I answer,

undoubtedly it may have done so; but if it did, it is a most unfortunate thing for your theory; for the fact implies that the Deity has planned His types in such a way as to suggest the counter-theory of descent. For instance, it would seem to me a most capricious thing in the Deity to make the eyes of an innumerable number of fish on exactly the same ideal type, and then to make the eye of the octopus so exactly like these other eyes in superficial appearance as to deceive so accomplished a naturalist as Mr. Mivart, and yet to take scrupulous care that in no one ideal particular should this solitary eye resemble all the host of other eyes. However, adopting for the sake of argument this gigantic assumption, let us suppose that God laid down these arbitrary rules for his own guidance in creation, and let us see to what it leads. If, as assumed, the Deity formed a certain number of ideal types, and determined that on no account should He allow any part of one type to appear in any part of another, surely we should expect that within the limits of the same type the same typical structures should always be present. Thus, remember what desperate efforts, so to speak, there have been made to maintain the uniformity of type in the case of the arm, and should we not expect that in other and similar cases similar efforts should be made? Yet we repeatedly find that this is not the case. Even in the whale, as we have seen, the hind limbs are not apparent; and it is impossible to see in what respect the hind limbs are of any less ideal value than the fore limbs, which, as we have also seen, are so carefully preserved in nearly all vertebrated animals except the snakes, where again we meet in this particular with a sudden and sublime indifference to the maintenance of a typical structure. Now I say that if the theory of ideal types is true, we have in these facts evidence of the most unreasonable inconsistency; for no explanation can be assigned why so much care should have been taken to maintain the type in some cases, while such reckless indifference should have been displayed towards maintaining it in others. But the theory of descent with continued adaptive modification fully explains all the known cases; for in every case the degree of divergence from the typical structure which an organism presents corresponds with the length of time during which the divergence has been going on. Thus we scarcely ever meet with any great departure from the typical form—such as the absence of limbs—without some of the other organs in the body being so far modified as of themselves to indicate, on the supposition of descent with modification, that the animal or plant must have been subject to the modifying influences for a long series of generations. Now this combined testimony of a number of organs in the same organism is what the theory of descent would lead us to expect, while the rival theory of design can offer no explanation of the fact,

that when one organ shows a conspicuous departure from the supposed ideal type, some of the other organs in the same organism should tend to keep it company by doing likewise.¹

I will now briefly touch on another branch of the argument from Morphology—the argument from rudimentary structures. Throughout the animal and vegetable kingdoms we constantly meet with dwarfed and useless representatives of organs, which in other and allied kinds of animals and plants are of large size and functional utility. Thus, for instance, the unborn whale has rudimentary teeth which are never destined to cut the gums; and we all know that our own rudimentary tail is of no practical service. Now rudimentary organs of this kind are of so common occurrence that almost every species presents one or more of them. The question, therefore, is—How are they to be accounted for? Of course the theory of descent with adaptive modification has a delightfully simple answer to supply, viz., that when from changed conditions of life an organ which was previously useful becomes useless, natural selection, combined with disuse and so-called economy of growth, will cause it to dwindle till it becomes a rudiment. On the other hand, the theory of special creation can only maintain that these rudiments are formed for the sake of adhering to an ideal type. Now here again the former theory is triumphant over the latter; for without waiting to dispute the wisdom of making dwarfed and useless structures merely for the whimsical motive assigned, surely if so extraordinary a method is adopted in so many cases, we should expect that in consistency it would be adopted in all cases. This reasonable expectation, however, is far from being realised. In numberless cases, such as that of the fore limbs of serpents, no vestige of a rudiment is present. But the vacillating policy in the matter of rudiments does not end here; for it is shown if possible in a more aggravated form where within the limits of the same natural group of organisms a rudiment is sometimes present and sometimes absent. For instance, to take again the case of limbs, in nearly all the numerous species of snakes there are no vestiges of limbs at all; but in the python we find beneath the skin very tiny rudiments of the hind limbs. Now I put it to every reasonable man, whether it is a worthy conception of Deity that, while neglecting to maintain unity of ideal in the case of nearly all the numerous species of snakes, He should have added a tiny rudiment in the case of the python, and even in that case to have maintained his ideal type very inefficiently, inasmuch as only two limbs instead of four are represented. Or take, again, the case of the limb in other animals. Five toes seem to constitute the

(1) This consideration is, I believe, original. Several special exceptions to its validity might be cited, but as a general principle it certainly holds good.

ideal type, notwithstanding that in numberless cases this ideal fails in its structural expression. Now, in the case of the horse, one toe appears to have become developed at the expense of the others; for the so-called knee of the horse is really the wrist or ankle, and the so-called shank, the middle toe or finger very much enlarged. But on each side of this enlarged toe there are, beneath the skin, rudimentary bones of two other toes, the so-called splint-bones. So far good, but three toes are not five; so special creationists must suppose that while in this case the Deity has, so to speak, struggled to maintain the uniformity of his ideal, his efforts have nevertheless conspicuously failed. How much less strained is the scientific interpretation; for I may mention that in this particular case, besides the general inference that rudiments refer us to a remote ancestry, we have direct palæontological evidence that there have been a whole series of extinct horse-like animals, which began low down in the geological strata with five toes; these then become reduced to four and next to three, after which the two lateral toes became rudimentary, as we now see them in oxen. Lastly, as we come nearer to recent times, we find fossils of the existing horse, with the lateral toes shortened up to the condition of splint bones. Thus we have some half-dozen different kinds of horse, all standing in a linear series in time as in structure, between the earliest representatives with the typical number of five toes, and the existing very aberrant form with only one toe.

But this allusion to fossils leads me to the next division of my subject—the argument from Geology. It is not, however, necessary to say much on this head, for the simple reason that the whole body of geological evidence is for the most part of one kind, which although of a very massive, is of a very simple character. That is to say, apart from the increasingly numerous cases, such as the one just mentioned, which geology supplies of extinct “intermediate links” between *particular* species now living, the great weight of the geological evidence consists in the *general* fact, that of all the thousands of specific forms of life which palæontology reveals to us as having lived on this planet in times past, there is no instance of a highly organised form occurring low down in the geological series. On the contrary, there is the best evidence to show that since the first dawn of life in the occurrence of the simplest organisms, until the meridian splendour of life as now we see it, gradual advance from the general to the special—from the low to the high—from the few and simple to the many and complex, has been the Law of Organic Nature. And of course it is needless to say that this is precisely the law to which the process of descent with adaptive modification would of necessity give rise.

The argument from Geology is the argument from the Distribution of Species in Time. I will, therefore, next take the argument from the Distribution of Species in Space—that is, the present Geographical Distribution of plants and animals. It is easy to see that this must be a most important argument, if we reflect that as the theory of descent with adaptive modification implies slow and gradual change of one species into another, and a still more slow and gradual change of one genus, family, or order into another genus, family, or order, we should expect on this theory that the organic types living on any given geographical area should be found to resemble or to differ from organic types living elsewhere, according as the area is connected or disconnected with other geographical areas. And this we find to be the case, as abundant evidence proves. For, to quote from Mr. Darwin, “barriers of any kind, or obstacles to free migration, are related in a close and important manner to the differences between the productions of various regions. We see this in the great difference in nearly all the terrestrial productions of the New and Old Worlds, excepting in the northern parts, where the land almost joins. . . . We see the same fact in the great difference between the inhabitants of Australia, Africa, and South America under the same latitude, for these countries are almost as much isolated from one another as possible. On each continent, also, we see the same fact; for on the opposite sides of lofty and continuous mountain ranges, of great deserts, and even of large rivers, we find different productions; though as mountain chains, deserts, &c., are not so impassable, or likely to have endured so long as the ocean-separated continents, the differences are very inferior in degree to those characteristic of distinct continents.” That is to say, the differences are usually confined to species and genera, whereas in the case of continents the differences extend to orders and classes. Similarly in marine productions the same laws prevail, the species on the different sides of the American Continent, for instance, being very distinct. Now this law cannot be explained by any reasonable argument from design.

And still stronger does this argument become when we look to the fossil species contained on different continents; for these fossil species invariably present the same characteristic stamp as the living species now flourishing on the same continents. Thus in America we find fossils all presenting the characteristically American types of animals, and in Australia the characteristically Australian types, and so on. That is to say, on every continent the dead species resemble the living species, as we may expect that they should if they are all bound together by the ties of hereditary descent; while, if different continents are compared, the fossil species are as unlike as we have seen the living species to be.

Turning next to the case of oceanic islands, situated at some distance from a continent. In these cases the plants and animals found on the island, though very often differing from all other plants and animals in the world as regards their specific type, nevertheless in generic type resemble the plants and animals of the neighbouring continent. The inference clearly is, that the island has been stocked from the continent with these types—either by winds, currents, floating trees, or numerous other modes of transport—and that, after settling in the island, some of these imported types have retained their specific characters, while others have varied so as to become specific types peculiar to that island. The Galapagos Archipelago islands are particularly instructive in this connection; for while the whole group of islands lies at a distance of over five hundred miles from the shores of South America, the constituent islands are separated from one another by straits varying from twenty to thirty miles. Now, to quote from Darwin, “Each separate island of the Galapagos Archipelago is tenanted, and the fact is a marvellous one, by many distinct species; but these species are related to each other in a very much closer manner than to the inhabitants of the American Continent.” That is to say, the American Continent being some fifteen times the distance from these islands that they are from one another, emigration to them from the continent is of much more rare occurrence than emigration from one island to another; and therefore, as more time for variation is thus allowed, while the differences between the inhabitants of island and island are only specific, the differences between the inhabitants of the islands as a group and the inhabitants of the American Continent are very often generic. I may mention, in passing, that it was upon discovering these relations in the case of the Galapagos Archipelago, and pondering upon them as “marvellous facts,” that Mr. Darwin was first led to entertain the idea that the doctrine of descent might be the grand truth for which the science of the nineteenth century was waiting.

The evidence from oceanic islands, however, is not yet exhausted; for in no part of the world is there an oceanic island more than a certain distance from a mainland in which any species of the large class of frogs, toads, and newts is to be found. Why is this? Simply because these animals and their spawn are quickly killed by contact with sea-water; and therefore frogs, toads, and newts have never been able to reach oceanic islands in a living state. Similarly in all oceanic islands situated more than three hundred miles from land, no species of the whole class of mammals is to be found, excepting species of the only order of mammals which can fly, viz., bats. And, as if to make the case still stronger, these forlornly created species of bats often differ from all other bats in the world. But can we, as reasonable men, suppose that the Deity has chosen,

without any apparent reason, never to create any frog, toad, newt, or mammal on any oceanic island, save only such species as are able to fly? Or, if we go so far as to say, "There may have been some hidden reason why batrachians and quadrupeds should not have been created on oceanic islands," I will adduce another very remarkable fact, viz., that on some of these islands there occur species of plants, the seeds of which are provided with numerous hooks adapted to catch the hair of moving quadrupeds, and so to become disseminated. But, as we have just seen, there are no quadrupeds in these islands to meet this case of adaptation; so that special-creationists must resort to the almost impious hypothesis that in these cases the Deity only carried out half his plan, in that while He made an elaborate provision for plants, which depended for its efficiency on the presence of quadrupeds, He nevertheless after all neglected to place the quadrupeds in the same islands with the plants! Now, I submit that such abortive attempts at adaptation bring the thesis of the special-creationists to a *reductio ad absurdum*; so that the only possible explanation before us is that, while the seeds of these plants were able to float to the islands, the quadrupeds were not able to swim. Perhaps, however, in sheer desperation, the special-creationists will try to take refuge in the assumption that oceanic islands differ from continents in not having been the scenes of creative power, and have therefore depended on immigration for their inhabitants. But here again there is no standing-room, for we have already seen that oceanic islands are particularly rich in peculiar species which occur nowhere else in the world; so that, as a matter of fact, if the special creation theory is true, we must conclude that oceanic islands have been the theatres of extraordinary creative activity; although an exception has always been carefully made to the detriment of frogs, toads, newts, and mammals, save only such as are able to fly.

If space permitted, I could adduce several other highly instructive facts in this argument from geographical distribution; but I will content myself with mentioning only one other. When Mr. Wallace was at the Malay Archipelago, he observed that the quadrupeds inhabiting the various islands belonged to the same or to closely allied species. But he also observed that all the quadrupeds inhabiting the islands lying on one side of an imaginary sinuous line, differed widely from the quadrupeds inhabiting the islands lying on the other side of that line. Now soundings showed that, in exact correspondence with this imaginary sinuous line, the sea was much deeper than in any other part of the Archipelago. Consequently, how beautiful is the explanation. We have only to suppose that at some previous time the sea-bottom was raised sufficiently to unite all the islands on each side of the deep water into two great tracts of

land, separated from one another by the deep strait of water. Each of these great tracts of land would then have had its own distinctive kinds of quadrupeds—just as the American quadrupeds are now distinct from the European; for the comparatively narrow strait between the then Malay Continents would have offered as effectual a barrier to the migration of quadrupeds as does the Atlantic Ocean at the present day. Hence, when all the land slowly subsided, so as to leave only its mountain-chains and table-lands standing above the surface in the form of islands, we now have the state of things which Mr. Wallace describes, viz., two large groups of islands with the quadrupeds on the one group differing widely from the quadrupeds on the other, while within the limits of the same group the quadrupeds inhabiting different islands all belong to the same or to closely allied species.

So much, then, for the argument from geographical distribution—the many facts of crucial importance which it affords almost resembling so many experiments devised by Nature to prove the falsity of the special creation hypothesis. For now, let it in conclusion be observed, that there is no *physiological* reason why animals and plants of the different characters observed should inhabit different continents, islands, seas, and so forth. As Darwin observes, “there is hardly a climate or condition in the Old World which cannot be paralleled in the New . . . and yet how widely different are their living productions.” And that it is not the suitability of organisms to the areas which they inhabit which has determined their creation upon those areas, is conclusively proved by the effects of the artificial transportation of species by man. For in such cases it frequently happens that the imported species thrives quite as well in its new as in its old home, and indeed often supplants the native species. As the Maoris say, “As the white man’s rat has driven away the native rat, so the European fly has driven away our fly, so the clover kills our fern, and so will the Maori himself disappear before the white man.” Upon the whole then we are driven to the conclusion, that if the special creation theory is true, the various plants and animals have not been placed in the various habitats which they occupy with any reference to the suitability of these habitats to the organizations of these particular plants and animals. So that, considering all the evidence under the head of geographical distribution, I think we are driven to the yet further conclusion, that if the special creation theory is true, the only principle which appears to have been consistently followed in the geographical deposition of species, is the principle of so depositing them as in all cases to make it appear that the supposition of their having been thus deposited is not merely a highly dubious one, but one which, on the face of it, is conspicuously absurd.

There is still another important line of evidence which we cannot afford to overlook; I mean the argument from Embryology. To economise time, I shall not wait to explain the considerations which obviously lead to the anticipation that, if the theory of descent by inheritance is true, the life history of the individual ought to constitute a sort of condensed epitome of the whole history of its descent. But taking this anticipation for granted, as it is fully realised by the facts of embryology, it follows that the science of embryology affords perhaps the strongest of all the strong arguments in favour of evolution. From the nature of the case, however, the evidence under this head requires special training to appreciate; so I will merely observe, in general terms, that the higher animals almost invariably pass through the same embryological stages as the lower ones, up to the time when the higher animal begins to assume its higher characters. Thus, for instance, to take the case of the highest animal, Man, his development begins from a speck of living matter similar to that from which the development of a plant begins. And, when his animality becomes established, he exhibits the fundamental anatomical qualities which characterise such lowly animals as the jelly-fish. Next he is marked off as a vertebrate, but it cannot be said whether he is to be a fish, a snake, a bird, or a beast. Later on it is evident that he is to be a mammal; but not till still later can it be said to which order of mammals he belongs. Eventually, however, the question becomes narrowed down to Man or Monkey, and it is only a few months before birth that an embryologist can pronounce the young animal to be the lord of creation.

Now this progressive inheritance by higher types of embryological characters common to lower types is a fact which tells greatly in favour of the theory of Descent, whilst it seems almost fatal to the theory of Design. For instance, to take a specific case, Mr. Lowes remarks of a species of salamander—which differs from most salamanders in being exclusively terrestrial—that although its young ones can never require gills, yet on cutting open a pregnant female we find these young ones to possess gills like aquatic salamanders, and when placed in the water they swim about like the tadpoles of the water newt. Now to suppose that these utterly useless gills were specially designed is to suppose design without any assignable purpose; for even the far-fetched assumption that a unity of ideal is the cause of organic affinities, becomes positively ridiculous when applied to the case of embryonic structures. Who, for instance, will have the courage to affirm that the Deity had any such motive in providing, not only the unborn young of specially created salamanders, but also the unborn young of specially created man, with the essential anatomical features of gills? Or why, with such a motive, should He have clothed the unborn child

with hair like an ape—unless, indeed, He intended to refer us to the ape as to our ancestor? ¹

Such, then, is a sketch of the evidence in favour of Organic Evolution. Of course in such a meagre outline it has not been possible to do justice to that evidence, which should be studied in detail, rather than looked at in such a bird's-eye view as I have presented. Nevertheless enough, I hope, has been said to convince all reasonable persons that any longer to withhold assent from so vast a body of evidence is a token, not of intellectual prudence, but of intellectual incapacity. With Professor Huxley, therefore, I exclaim, "Choose your hypothesis; I have chosen mine, and I will not run the risk of insulting any sane man by asking him which he chooses." These words, I submit, are not in the least too strong; for if any man can study the many and important lines of evidence all converging on the central truth that Evolution has been the Law of Organic Nature, and still fail to perceive the certainty of that truth, then I say that that man—either on account of his prejudices or from his inability to estimate the value of evidence—must properly be regarded as a weak-minded man. Or, to state the case in another way, if such a man were to say to me, "Notwithstanding all your lines of evidence, I still believe in special design manifested in creation," I should reply, "And in this I fully agree with you; for if, notwithstanding these numerous and important lines of evidence,

(1) The human embryo, soon after it assumes its vertebrate character, begins with gill-like slits on each side of the neck, up to which the arteries run in arching branches, as in a fish; the heart is at first a simple pulsating chamber, like the heart of the lowest fishes; at a later period there is a movable tail considerably longer than the legs; the great toe projects sideways from the foot, like the toes of adult monkeys and apes; and, during the sixth month, the whole body is covered very thickly with hair, extending even over the face and ears—everywhere, indeed, save on the lower sides of the hands and feet, which are also bare in the adult forms of monkeys.

I may also here mention two other weighty considerations in favour of Natural Selection as against Supernatural Design. One is, that the mechanisms which are met with in organic nature, although in general wonderfully perfect, are not always ideally perfect. Thus, for instance, the most beautiful mechanism in nature is probably the eye, and yet it is cynically observed by Professor Helmholtz—who is the highest authority both in the physics and in the physiology of the subject—that if his optician were to send him such an instrument he would return it for alterations.

The other consideration is, that amid all the millions of mechanisms in organic nature there is no one instance of a mechanism occurring in one species for the exclusive benefit of another species, although there are a few cases in which a mechanism that is of benefit to its possessor has come also by natural selection to be utilised by other species. Now on the Beneficent Design theory it is impossible to understand why, when all the mechanisms in the same species are invariably correlated for the benefit of that species, there should never be any such correlation between mechanisms in different species. For how magnificent a display of divine beneficence would organic nature have afforded, if all, or even some, species had been so inter-related as to minister to each other's necessities! Organic species might then have been likened to a countless multitude of voices all singing in one harmonious psalm of praise. But as it is, we see no vestige of such co-ordination; every species is for itself, and for itself alone—an outcome of the always and everywhere fiercely raging struggle for life.

the theory which they substantiate is false, then to my mind we have the best conceivable evidence of very special design having been manifested in creation—the special design, namely, to deceive mankind by an elaborate, detailed, and systematic fraud.” For if the theory of special creation is true, I hold that, as no one fact can be adduced in its favour, while so vast a body of facts can be adduced against it, the only possible explanation of so extraordinary a circumstance would be that of a mendacious intelligence of superhuman power carefully disposing all the observable facts of his creation in such a way as to compel his rational creatures, by the best and most impartial use of their rational faculties, to conclude that the theory of evolution is as certainly true as the theory of special creation is conspicuously false.

The principle obstacle which the doctrine of Evolution encounters in the popular mind is, that the conception of Man being the lineal descendant of Monkey is a conception which is degrading to the dignity of the former animal. Now this objection is purely a matter of feeling or sentiment, and, as such, I am not able to meet it. If you think that Man is any the less human because his origin is now proved to have been derivative, I cannot change that decision on your part; I can only express dissent from it on my own. But although I cannot affect your sentiments in this matter, I may be permitted to point out that, as they are only sentiments, they are quite worthless as arguments or guides to truth. I have yet to learn that the “dignity of Man” is a matter of any concern to our Mother Nature, who in all her dealings appears, to say the least, to treat us in rather a matter-of-fact sort of way. Indeed, so far is she from respecting our ideas of “dignity,” that whenever these ideas have been applied to any of her processes, the progress of science has been destined rudely to dispel them. Thus, for instance, when the sun-spots were first observed they were indignantly denied by the Aristotelians, on the ground of its being “impossible that the eye of the universe could suffer from ophthalmia;” and when Kepler made his great discovery of the accelerated and retarded motion of the planets in different parts of their orbits, many persons refused to entertain the conception, on the ground that it was “undignified” for heavenly bodies to hurry and slacken their pace in accordance with Kepler’s law. This now seems most absurd to us; but to posterity it will not seem nearly so much so as that, notwithstanding such precedents, persons should still be found to object to Darwin’s discovery, not because they were anxious to maintain the dignity of the heavenly bodies, but because they were so ludicrously anxious to maintain the dignity of their own! Good it is for Man, puffed up with such silly pride, that Nature teaches him humility.

GEORGE J. ROMANES.

A PAGE OF DIPLOMATIC HISTORY.

M. TAINE, in the second volume of his brilliant work, *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*, points to the testimony of those who wrote down what took place, day by day, without regard to the subsequent publication of their notes, as to that which proved most useful to him in his endeavour to reconstruct the history of the Revolution. This statement has called forth publications of every kind—biographies, correspondences, diaries—from private and public archives. The Swedish collections have proved particularly valuable. Baron Klinkowström published the important correspondence of Count Axel Fersen with Gustavus III. and his councillors, and the year 1881 brought a contribution for which we are indebted to the Royal Archives of Stockholm. This is the diplomatic correspondence of Baron Staël-Holstein, from 1783 to 1799, edited by L. Léouzon Le Duc,¹ who is already known in literature as the author of a life of Gustavus III.

Few names of the last century are more familiar than that of Staël, but hitherto it has recalled the memory of Necker's daughter, who adopted it by her marriage with the Swedish Ambassador to the Court of Versailles. Baron Staël himself, who enjoyed the doubtful privilege of being the husband of a celebrated woman, has hardly attracted attention, and the little known of him was not flattering. J. E. Bollmann, for example, the amiable and intelligent German doctor, who came to Paris in 1792, and saved the life of Count Narbonne after the 10th of August by guiding a daring flight to London, has nothing better to say of Baron Staël than that his wife was not married, but tied to a man who could not have invented a new dish of potatoes, much less gunpowder.² It must, of course, be borne in mind that Bollmann, who proved his chivalrous devotion to Madame de Staël by saving, at the risk of his own, the life of a person in whom she was so much interested, cannot be implicitly trusted when speaking of her husband. But another contemporary, and quite a first-rate observer, Morris, the American statesman, speaks of the Swedish Ambassador as of a man unfit to be intrusted with a serious negotiation.³ The correspondence published by Léouzon

(1) *Correspondance diplomatique du Baron de Staël-Holstein, Ambassadeur de Suède en France, et de son successeur comme Chargé d'Affaires, le Baron Brinkmann. Documents inédits sur la Révolution (1783—1799), recueillis aux archives royales de Suède et publiés avec une introduction par L. Léouzon Le Duc.* Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1881. Vol. i.

(2) Varnhagen v. Ense. *Denkwürdigkeiten u. vermischte Schriften*, 1837—1840. Vol. i. p. 161. Justus Erich Bollmann.

(3) Jared Sparks' *Life of Governor Morris, with selections from his correspondence.* Vol. ii. p. 247.

Le Duc, which affords for the first time an opportunity of testing these judgments, by no means confirms their severity. Staël does not belong to that class of great, high-minded statesmen, who in the midst of fermenting ideas and stormy times shape their own course and keep their end steadily in view. His mistake, like that of so many others, was to believe in the realisation of dreams and hopes, which, happily for mankind, did not all prove idle. When we reflect how extremely limited in number those were who did not succumb to the influences of that time, it is hardly fair to reproach Staël with not having been one of the exceptions. On the other hand, he possessed keen powers of observation and an exceedingly accurate knowledge of the position of affairs. He understood how to make the most of his sources of information and carried independence of thought to the length of resistance, and even of rebellion, against his own Government. If he shared the opinions of Necker's circle, it was by no means because he submitted to its intellectual ascendancy, but because his political convictions moved on the same lines, at least as long as Necker remained in power. As late as the autumn of 1789 the political party which he considered most honest and trustworthy was the constitutional group led by Mounier, of whom he says that, although it was he who had inaugurated the movement in Dauphiné, he had already become one of the most moderate. But while thus admiring him, Staël failed to perceive the principle of his whole political system. "Mounier," he wrote, "is as adverse to aristocracy as the most resolute democrat; but, convinced as he is of the necessity of a monarchy, and of a strong executive for the maintenance of order in France, he is a passionate admirer of the English Constitution, two chambers, the absolute veto, and, in a word, of quite a different order of things from what is desired here. . . . However sound the arguments in support of these views may be, Mounier ought to give them up because they are impracticable. The hatred of aristocracy is so strong that a second chamber would always be considered its refuge." These concluding words serve to show that the views of Staël did not rest on the basis of a sound political doctrine, and how it came to pass that, after fully sympathising with the moderate party in 1780, he was driven into the ranks of their antagonists, when the tide turned against them. Like so many others, from his friend Lafayette down to the lowest orator of the Palais Royal, he failed to discriminate between the deservedly despised nobles, who hung about the Court at Versailles, and the true aristocratic elements in the country. Those elements, which comprised the great landowners, the magistracy, the clergy, the haute finance, could have brought to the public service high character, political experience, and intellectual training, which no Government can dispense with. So little were they opposed to reform

that they actually inaugurated the movement. Staël acknowledges this well-known fact when he says that "the French Revolution was begun by the resistance of the nobility, the clergy, and the parliaments." He also reminds his sovereign that "monarchy is impossible without the rights of nobility and a political hierarchy." But when it comes to a practical test, and he has to advise on the situation, he loses sight of these truths and contradicts himself. The original mistake of confounding those who enjoyed the worn-out privileges of the *Ancien Régime* with the necessary supports of constitutional monarchy recurs over and over again. In September, 1791, he writes to Gustavus III., "It cannot be too often repeated that the Revolution is directed against the nobility, and not against the throne. The King has been insulted as the protector of the nobility, rather than as head of the executive. . . . If he consents to separate his cause from that of the aristocracy, he is sure of the support of the whole country." The immediate future contradicted this assertion. After all the foundations of society had been destroyed to gratify mere theory, and all barriers between the throne and the people removed, the King fell. It was not Baron Staël but Morris the Republican who proved right in insisting from the very beginning of the Revolution on the necessity of reverence for the sovereign, respect for acquired rights, and prudence, not only in the choice of the end to be aimed at, but also in the selection of the means by which it was to be attained.

However, in the case of Staël, the error of the statesman enhances the value of the witness. If his dispatches had been written by a defender of the old system, a champion of the reigning classes, or an upholder of the theory of the division of powers under a strong monarchy, they would have been received with great reserve. As the testimony of a man who twice sacrificed his brilliant position to his predilection for democratic institutions, they are above suspicion when they confirm on nearly every page the letters of Jefferson and Morris, the foresight of Pitt and Washington, the prophetic warnings of Burke, or the conclusions of Tocqueville, Lavergne and Taine. The agreement is so striking that sometimes the mind seems to be labouring under a delusion, and to be dealing with a literary work of yesterday instead of with a narrative written eighty years ago. Taine says in a well-known passage on the situation after the 14th of July, "It was not the destruction of one Government to make room for another, but a Government which fell, to be replaced by the despotism of the mob." Staël, speaking of the same events, writes to Gustavus III.: "Since the Executive has been entirely taken out of the King's hands by the refusal of the troops to act against their fellow-subjects, anarchy reigns in his stead. The people alone command and are obeyed, for they carry out their own sen-

tences." Malouet did not express himself more clearly when he said that "to every unprejudiced mind the Reign of Terror dates from the 14th of July."

When the new sovereign, the people, extended its sway over the National Assembly, dictated its orders from the tribunes, or extorted their enactment by armed gangs from the terror of the representatives, Staël characterised the situation in these words: "Hitherto anarchy has been considered a condition of the Revolutionary situation; it is now a consequence of the institutions themselves."

These few remarks may tend to prove that Staël's statements would have met with deserved attention had they not been made known so much later than those of most of his contemporaries. Even now, however, no historian who has to deal with the times of the Revolution will pass him by unnoticed, and therefore it may not prove useless to get better acquainted with his life and fortunes.

Erich Magnus Baron Staël served in his youth in the Swedish army, from which he retired in 1776, in order to become one of the Queen's chamberlains, and at the age of twenty-nine was appointed secretary to the Swedish Embassy at Paris. His chief, Count Creutz, informed Gustavus III. that the young diplomat was exceedingly well received there, *réussit admirablement*, and patronised by the Countess Jules de Polignac, Mesdames de Gontaut, de la Marck, de Boufflers, and others, then at the head of society. He is described at this period as a man of sympathetic appearance, well informed, but more painstaking than brilliant. A few years later he secured the favour of the Court, which was the best passport to that of his own sovereign, whose sympathies for everything French, and chivalrous admiration and friendship for Marie Antoinette caused him to follow with the greatest interest everything that went on in France. Staël did not allow these advantages to escape him. Although a member of an ancient house, illustrious in the history of its country, he had no fortune. As early as 1781 his attention was directed to Anne Germaine, Necker's only daughter, then in her sixteenth year, but already much courted, and heiress to a fortune which, for those days, was enormous. Matrimonial alliances between the highest nobility and the great financial houses had never been unusual in France; a young man in the position of Staël could therefore hardly aspire to the hand of Mlle. Necker, were it not that her creed excluded the majority of desirable suitors in a country where Protestants were only beginning to recover civil rights and equality. But even under the constellations as they then stood, Staël could not hope for success without the expectation of succeeding Creutz and without powerful protection. He received this from Madame de Boufflers and from the Queen herself, who, in a letter to Gustavus III., expressed her desire to see Staël fixed at Paris. The King, however, hesitated,

and, as it appeared later, had other projects in view. He wished to appoint his favourite, Baron Taube, Ambassador at Paris; and Count Creutz, who was recalled in 1783 and placed at the head of the Swedish Government, had to remind him in firm but respectful language of the displeasure with which any other than Staël would be received by the French Court. The King, who got subsidies from France, which he neither could nor would dispense with, was induced to give way. Before the end of 1783 Staël was Minister Plenipotentiary, then Ambassador, and on the 24th of November, Gustavus III., then travelling in Italy, wrote to him: "If you marry Mdlle. Necker you will be the richest nobleman of your country, and can say like Cæsar, better be first there than second in Rome;" and on the 17th of December: "Try to succeed, and I myself will go to Paris to sign your marriage contract." Madame de Boufflers then summed up the conditions of the Neckers: the embassy at Paris for life; 25,000 francs a year in case unforeseen events should deprive him of it; and the promise never to take his wife to Sweden for any length of time, and never without her consent. These conditions were acceded to. But by the time Gustavus reached Paris in 1784, on his way home from Italy, new difficulties had arisen, and he saw nothing of the Neckers, who had gone for the summer to their country house at Coppet, near Geneva. The protracted negotiations had led to the formation of other plans, to which we need not allude except to say that on the list of pretenders for the hand of Mdlle. Necker, which includes the great name of Pitt, were those of two fellow-countrymen of Staël's, Count Axel Fersen and Count Stedingk. These two young friends of King Gustavus had recently returned from America, where they had taken part in the War of Independence. They were both officers in the Swedish army, and also in the French foreign regiment, the Royal Suédois. Stedingk had distinguished himself at the storming of Savannah and was represented on the Paris stage in a play in which this feat was dramatised, and it was much noticed that Mdlle. Necker also celebrated it in verse. This little intermezzo, however, did not go further, and Stedingk became afterwards Swedish Ambassador at St. Petersburg. But it only rested with his friend and brother-in-arms, whose refined and somewhat melancholy appearance obtained for him the name of "le beau Fersen," to press his suit and win the prize. A letter addressed to him by Gustavus in June, 1785, shows how much the King would have liked it. "If I am to believe the newspapers," he wrote, "you are about to make a great *parti*, which poor Staël seems not to have been able to manage. This does not surprise me. There are a hundred reasons why Necker should prefer you to any one else; among these, your fortune is not the least in the eyes of a banker. Still I doubt it, knowing as I do your aversion to marriage and your

predilection for English ladies." The King was right, and Fersen died unmarried.

That which finally determined the Neckers to consent to the marriage with Staël was the circumstance that it would not involve the separation of the future Madame de Staël from her parents and Paris society, a condition which proved so essential for her happiness her whole life through. The marriage was celebrated on the 14th of January, 1786. Besides her fortune she brought her husband literary distinction as the authoress of *Letters on Rousseau*, and, although no beauty, the blooming freshness of twenty. Nearly all her contemporaries thought Madame de Staël plain, yet they never fail to tell how they were won by the expression of her splendid eyes, and still more by an undefinable charm which made them forget her want of beauty. It was chiefly due to the circumstance that this female genius was exceedingly good-natured, with an excellent heart, and above all, simple and natural. Twenty years later she produced the same impression at Weimar, and it is this distinctive quality which explains the lasting devotion of her friends.

Nothing, therefore, was wanting to make her marriage happy as well as brilliant, except that she had neglected to consult her own heart. Staël's friends all declared that he entertained for his wife not merely a passing affection, but a lasting feeling of love, to which she did not respond. One of them, Reuterholm, wrote in 1793: "Although his amiable wife is far from friendly to him, Staël has never ceased to remain devoted to her." This is confirmed by a letter of Staël's to Reuterholm, which, in other respects, is not without interest.

The characteristic note of the eighteenth century in its decline is a predilection for things mystical and mysterious. In some it showed itself in religious sentimentalism, in others in a hankering after secret societies and superstitious usages, which sound religious instruction would have taught a child to despise. The want of the supernatural, so long derided and denied, led to a craving for hidden mysteries and to a belief in new prophets, of whom the most eminent, the theosophist St. Martin, marks the culmination of a line of thought, at the lowest point of which stands the impostor Cagliostro. In common with the philosophers of the eighteenth century, the adepts in this movement substituted the idea of happiness for that of duty, and preferred to play with emotion rather than submit to rigid rules of conduct. In this respect Gustavus III. was the true son of his time; he consulted adventuresses, believed in signs and wonders, and while in Rome occupied himself with plans for rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem. Similar lines of thought may be traced in Staël. The language which he uses in his letter to Reuterholm is of the pietistic character, so common among Protestants of

that day. He complains of want of humility, prays for faith, mourns that the old Adam is not dead, and declares himself worn out with sorrow and tears. "What I suffer now," he concludes, "I have well deserved, and it is a special grace of God that I am not tried more bitterly. But I am punished in my heart, and, notwithstanding my wickedness, I think my heart is good. Pray for my wife; may she never know the tortures I have suffered, and suffer still." Even without the passage last quoted, it would not be difficult to guess of what kind the trials were which drove him to seek comfort from above. Compared to these lamentations the following passage, which his young wife writes about "Emile," seems cold enough:—"Virtue is not, like glory, an object of emulation; those who strive for one brook no equals; those who seek after the other relax their efforts occasionally, when they meet with comrades in idleness." And the following remark is perhaps still more striking:—"Quant on renonce aux charmes de la vertu, il faut au moins avoir tous ceux que l'abandon du cœur peut donner."

From this time the family life of Staël hardly requires mention. He and his wife were frequently separated. They met only from time to time, at Paris or at Coppet, and their internal union was not renewed. They remained independent of each other in politics and literature, and Madame de Staël, who used to send to the King of Sweden a so-called "*Bulletin des Nouvelles*," evidently had no share in her husband's political correspondence. Still, the real interest of this correspondence dates from his marriage, which coincides with the portentous events which formed the prologue to the drama of the Revolution.

In the spring of 1787 Calonne had completed the ruin of the finances, and was replaced by Loménie de Brienne, the candidate of the Queen. What hopes he excited may be estimated from the fact that even Necker's son-in-law declared his appointment an excellent one, and praised not only his talents, but particularly his strength of will. The King, he says, chose him out of fear. "The panic was so great that, driven by the necessity for government, they had to throw themselves into the arms of the Archbishop." A few months later all was changed, and the same man accused of incapacity and weakness, "which," according to Staël, "is the chief fault of a nation like the French, which has lost nearly all sense of patriotism, and lives under the delusion that great things can be accomplished without sacrifice." His sympathies went with the notables, who, he contends, more than realised public expectation.

During all these years the language of Staël about the Queen is favourable. In April, 1785, he says, "Her prudence gives her such superiority that the most artful intrigue is powerless to damage her." When at the same time Necker's newly published book,

Sur l'Administration des Finances, gave rise to violent attacks upon its author, Marie Antoinette is said to have spoken warmly in his favour to the King. A year later Staël writes, alluding to the conclusion of the Procès du Collier, which had given the Queen no satisfaction for the insult she had received, "It is a pity that there is not a single trustworthy adviser about her, for, with amiable qualities, she combines requisite resolution to follow the right path, if only some one would point it out to her. It appears that her usual society has no special regard for her. At this moment the Polignacs and M. de Vaudreuil are on the side of the Cardinal, and the Comte d'Artois shows the greatest interest in him. On the whole I am not of opinion that the Queen meets with the sympathy she deserves. Even her desire to please is not prized as it would be in an ordinary lady." Unfortunately Baron Staël himself was destined to be one of those who contributed to fill the measure of injustice prepared for the Queen. He had nothing but praise for the bright, thoughtless hostess of Versailles and Trianon. But after agony and suffering had changed and transfigured Marie Antoinette to a degree which wrung from her bitterest enemies expressions of admiration, Staël became a severe critic of the conduct of her who had helped him to obtain what his heart most coveted. No political antagonism can remove the reproach of ingratitude which clings to his conduct towards her.

At the close of 1787 Staël points to public opinion as the power which really limited political authority, and constituted the difference between monarchy and despotism more efficiently than the Parliaments. The general desire for a revolutionary change had become so intense, that the choice of a good administrator was positively feared, because it would postpone the crisis. We know from others how public opinion was chiefly formed in the salons of Paris, and above all in that of Madame de Staël. Jefferson, then American minister in France, wrote to his Government that the frivolities of conversation had given way to political discussion. "Men, women, and children," he adds, "talk of nothing else, and all, as you know, talk a great deal. The press groans with daily productions which in point of boldness make an Englishman stare." This state of affairs and the necessity of providing supplies to meet an expenditure of a million livres a day, brought about the second Ministry of Necker. His appointment was received with the same demonstrations of joy as fifteen months before greeted the nomination of the Archbishop of Toulouse, who was now burnt in effigy. Staël says, nobody doubted the new Minister would regenerate France, that public confidence in him was boundless, and that his genius, moderation, and moral bearing secured for him indescribable popularity. After stating that Necker owed his position not only to the desire

of the nation, but also to that of the Queen, he makes the important admission that the first few months of his father-in-law's administration passed over as honest men could wish: "that intrigue did not interfere in any way with his conduct of affairs, although they proved more difficult than could have been foreseen."

The motive which had induced the Court to meet the wishes of the people was soon made clear. The Queen had for years desired to see Loménio at the head of the government, and had at last succeeded, with the approval of the nation. When opinion changed, she did not change with it, but continued to believe in the capacity of the Minister of her choice. Open resistance was out of the question, but it was more than probable that the fickle multitude would behave towards Necker as it had done to the archbishop. Therefore Necker was appointed, in the certain hope that his popularity would fade more rapidly than that of his predecessor. But instead of trusting to the action of time, the Court in its blind impatience rushed headlong to destruction. The attempt to displace Necker would have alone sufficed to make Staël an adversary of the Queen; but in the meantime the foreign policy of his own country took a turn which relieved him from the necessity of taking into consideration the personal feelings of his King for the French Court. In 1788 Gustavus III. commenced a war with Russia under favourable auspices, for Catherine II. was then engaged in her second Turkish war. But at the moment when St. Petersburg seemed in danger of being captured by the Swedes, Gustavus saw his plans thwarted by mutiny among his own officers. They considered the war, which had been begun by the King on his own responsibility, as an invasion of the privileges of the nobility and an encroachment on constitutional rights, and actually opened negotiations with the Empress. In this crisis of his affairs nothing remained for the King but to place himself, very much against his own convictions, at the head of the commons, a policy which in the end led to his tragic death. He also desired to substitute a Russo-French-Austrian alliance for the friendly relations of Sweden with England and Prussia. Staël, a decided enemy of Russia, had tried to secure the pen of Mirabeau, and did succeed in obtaining the advocacy of Mallet du Pan in defence of the war with that country. He now feared the influence of Marie Antoinette in favour of the change of front of his King, and in order to counteract it he wrote to Gustavus in January, 1789: "I should be acting against my conscience and not as a faithful servant of your Majesty, were I to conceal that a French alliance in the present position of affairs would be at best useless. England and Prussia are the only two powers at the present moment that can keep Russia in check, whereas France is paralysed by its internal state." This chanced to be confirmed by Necker a few days later,

when he declared that discipline did not exist any more in France, and that the troops could no longer be depended upon.

The meeting of the States-General was preceded by famine throughout the country, by rioting, and by organized attacks on property. Staël acknowledges that the inaugural discourse of Necker did not come up to his expectations, and a few weeks afterwards he considered the spirit which animated the States far from being a good one, more regard being shown to personal interests than to the public welfare. He tells us how Necker never ceased to explain to the wavering King that there were two courses open to him : either to come to an understanding with the Court, the clergy, and the Parliaments, who seemed to agree that the States-General were not required, and to select a Ministry able and willing to carry out their policy ; or, if he shrank, as he well might, from the terrible responsibility of such a course, then to put himself at the head of the movement and try and guide it. "But," as Staël wrote, "he had no force of character to make up his mind, either for good or bad. M. Necker prevents much evil, and has to be satisfied with this pale glory." Even this modest appreciation of his father-in-law's usefulness was not free from illusion. Morris even then perceived that the popularity of Necker depended rather on the opposition he met with from one party than on any serious regard of the other. "It is the attempt to throw him down that saves him from falling. If they were not afraid of consequences he would be dismissed." A few days more and these consequences were no longer regarded. Necker was overthrown, and the State and the Monarchy brought to the verge of the abyss. At this moment Staël was, without reserve, on the popular side. The indignities offered to the Crown, the humiliation of the King, who had to make such an *amende honorable* at the Hôtel de Ville as, in the words of the democratic and radical Jefferson, "no sovereign ever made and no people ever received," all failed to soften him. He kept repeating to his own Government that the minds of men were so excited, the new ideas so widely spread, every town in the kingdom so completely on the side of the Tiers, that nothing could hinder the march of the Revolution, which, he insisted, threatened the privileged classes rather than the Monarchy. During the few days of the reaction he had felt his own position shaken, and had written to his Sovereign that he was sure the Queen of France desired he should be replaced by Fersen. At the same time he expresses himself as feeling secure, not so much on account of the promise of his King, to which he did not intend to hold him, as on account of his confidence in the sense of justice of Gustavus and in his repeated assurance of approval. Soon after, the conduct of the Assembly drove Staël to admit that perhaps, after all, those were right who thought France unfit for free institutions. "No sooner did the representatives of the people," he wrote, "realise that

they had the power in their hands, than far from endeavouring to moderate the passions of one party or the humiliations of the other, they did what they could to stimulate excitement. Instead of securing for the King powers which were necessary to put an end to lawlessness, they waste their time in useless debates." Things had now come to a pass, when, as Taine expresses it, the authority which had slipped out of the hands of the King had not been caught by the Assembly, but had fallen on the ground. The keenest observers on the spot were too near to perceive this clearly; they merely felt the ground shaking. Then came the sixth of October. That terrible day gave a specimen of what might be expected from the frivolity, violence, and immorality of the time. "The cruelty shown to the unhappy victims," Staël wrote, "exceeds imagination. People speak of blood and murder as formerly of a theatrical performance. While I write, there is a talk of setting fire to Paris. Several houses, among them my own, have been marked out for destruction." It was only a few days before that he had made a violent attack on Marie Antoinette. He accused her of wishing to be rid of Necker, whom, he said, she first got appointed, afterwards unworthily betrayed, and who was then her best safeguard. Now, after the horrors of that October day, even he had to acknowledge that the Queen's heroic character had caused the hearts of men to turn towards her. The sight of the captive King and of the Queen, who, by the merest chance, had just escaped assassination within the walls of her own palace, made so deep an impression on Staël's friend, Mounier, that he started off for Dauphiné with Lally Tollendal, resolved to provoke civil war rather than submit to the decrees of an Assembly which could no longer legislate in freedom. Rumour now talked of the dismissal of Necker and of the appointment of Mirabeau, but according to Staël, what kept Mirabeau back was "the feeling that he could not compete with Necker, and the knowledge that the latter would never consent to remain in the same Ministry with him." This egregious mistake about the talent and strength of Mirabeau is matched by another equally gross about Talleyrand, who was also spoken of as a possible Minister. "I think him," he writes, "far removed from all intrigues, and much too clever to wish to supersede Necker at a moment when everything is in a state of chaos. I am persuaded, therefore, there is nothing to fear from the Bishop of Autun." During those very same days Morris had some conversations with Talleyrand on that identical subject, and wrote to Washington, "The getting rid of Necker is a *sine quâ non* with the Bishop, who wants his place. . . . He tells me that, in his opinion, no administration can work well in which M. Necker has a share." The adroitness of Talleyrand in misleading Necker's friends and family is all the more remarkable from the circumstance that he was

a daily visitor in the salon of Madame de Staël, and one of her great admirers.

Notwithstanding these errors with regard to individuals, Staël saw clearly enough that although, at the beginning of 1790, the shadow of what authority remained was in the hands of Necker and Lafayette, nevertheless it was hopeless to expect success for the financial reforms of the Comptroller-General, because the executive was no longer strong enough to carry them through. He persisted, however, in spite of all things, in believing that the best chance for Louis XVI. was to put himself at the head of the Revolution, and as he had lost all legal authority, "he should strain every nerve to reconquer the power of love, which would win everything for him." In our days such words would seem idle declamation, unsuited to the serious business of public life. Then they were quite in harmony with the over-excited feelings of the age, and with its delight in melodramatic situations.

Six months later the alliance between Necker and Lafayette was a thing of the past, and the latter gave up pretending to defend the wreck of royal prerogative. Three years previously, his friend and admirer, Jefferson, had said of him that his *faible* was a canine appetite for popularity and fame; but he would get over this. Now, in 1790, Staël describes him as unable to sacrifice popularity. "Un pauvre scélérat qui heureusement ne sait l'être qu'à demi." Fersen wrote to Gustavus III., giving the key-note of the extreme right. Compared with him, the honest, much less brilliant, and hardly less vain Necker rose superior to popular applause. But he had no longer power, either for good or harm. "We make ministers," said his personal adversary, Mirabeau, "with the same object as we used to send our servants to the playhouse, to keep our places for us." And Sieyès, whom Madame de Staël "called the Newton of politics," described her father as merely an accomplished accountant, with poetical views and aspirations." When at last his Ministry came to an end, and he retired to private life unnoticed and unregretted, his friends endeavoured once more to cast the blame upon the Queen.

Staël compares Paris in 1791 to a mine on the point of exploding. More than a thousand houses were uninhabited, their inmates for the most part had fled the country, and there was a general feeling of uneasiness. Gustavus III. warned his ambassador that he would keep him in favour in proportion as the royal family of France were convinced of the sympathy and devotion of Sweden. Staël's reply explains his position. He reminds his Sovereign how the friendships of the Queen of France had failed him during his Russian war, and then goes on to say, "If I moderated the expression of my indignation against the new tyrants who are overturning

the throne, it was because I deemed it the interest of your Majesty to bide your time. I confess it is improbable that these men should modify their opinions and recur to a more healthy view of politics and real freedom. But should such a state of things come about, it is advisable not to exclude the possibility of negotiating, especially as they are never tired of repeating that the Swedish alliance is more desirable for France than any other. It is more than probable that I should have received overtures in that sense long ago, if horror of usurpation had not hampered my intercourse with them." In other words, while every effort of Gustavus III. was directed to the organization of the coalition against revolutionary France, whose commander-in-chief he expected to be, his ambassador was in relation with the Republican party and thwarting the plans of his Sovereign.

This was the state of affairs when a new episode, hitherto unnoticed by historians, attracted the unsteady mind of the King of Sweden. On the 14th of August, 1790, he made peace at Werelä with the Empress, in which the *status quo ante* was re-established. Hostilities, however, were not suspended between Russia and Turkey for a year later, and the Poles took advantage of the interval to make another effort to settle their affairs. Their new constitution embodied the principle of hereditary monarchy, and the right of succession to the crown was conferred on the Elector of Saxony. In Poland this arrangement met with only limited approval, but it was supported by Austria, whose interests it promoted. The Prussian Government, for reasons of its own, would have preferred either the Duke of Brunswick or the Duke of Södermanland. But as the new constitution maintained the Roman Catholic faith as the exclusive religion of the nation, the very first step of any Protestant prince must necessarily have been to join the Catholic communion.

Gustavus III., the head of the Lutheran Church, seems not to have given a thought to this vital condition when in January 1791, he instructed Staël to urge upon Count Potocki, the Polish ambassador at Paris, the propriety of selecting himself as the successor of Poniatowski. The Potocki family, however, had been gained for the Saxon candidature, and Staël had to inform his master, not without a touch of irony, that he had better seek other means "to forward his great and brilliant schemes." These were not to be found, and Gustavus returned with undivided energy to the idea of a coalition.

Henceforth, the unequal struggle between the King and his Ambassador can be traced in nearly every dispatch; but while the latter continued to defend his policy of non-intervention, he was forced to describe events which acted on the King as spurs on a noble steed. On the 18th of April, 1791, Louis XVI., accompanied

by the Queen, set out for St. Cloud in order to receive the sacraments at Easter from the hands of a nonjuring clergyman. But the mob, who had been informed of his intention, surrounded his carriage, insulted him for hours, and finally forced him to return to the Tuileries. "Hitherto," says Staël, "a sort of reverence for the person of the King outlived his authority; on that 18th of April this, too, was destroyed. This was no haphazard rioting; it was Paris which proclaimed that the King had broken faith, and left him to choose between abdication and submission. Thrice Lafayette ordered the National Guard to open a passage for the King, and thrice he was disobeyed. He has resigned to-day, but he should have broken his sword when his troops refused to act. As for the King, he can only save his life either by leaving Paris or by becoming more revolutionary than Barnavo. The appearance of a foreign army on the frontier would only render the misfortune complete." Staël did not overrate the significance of those events. They sealed the fate of the royal family. Henceforth the idea of flight took a more definite shape, till at last it was attempted with the connivance of Gustavus III. and the help of Fersen, and led to the consequences with which we are all acquainted. Staël was kept completely in the dark about it. In the apparent resignation of Louis XVI. he merely saw the indication of a turn to the policy he advocated. On the very eve of the 21st of June he renewed his assurances to his Sovereign that some of the most influential of the revolutionary leaders were favourable to a treaty which would be exceedingly advantageous to Sweden, and that the sole difficulty was the well-known aversion of Gustavus for their principles. When next day he heard of the flight of the King, and that it had been undertaken at the instigation of his own Sovereign, his indignation was boundless. He reported in due course the state of Paris, and how it was lucky for Fersen to have escaped, that the excitement was indescribable, and that he had had reason to fear for his personal safety. In his next letter, after describing the return of the royal family, he thus concludes: "It is simply impossible to imagine a more frightful and heartrending scene. I pity from the bottom of my heart those unfortunate persons who induced the King to adopt a plan as crude as it was dangerous. The health of the Queen has suffered grievously." Who the persons alluded to were, Gustavus III. knew but too well. Fersen wrote on his side to Marie Antoinette: "Staël says that I have ruined you and the King, and that ambition has prompted my action. He is right, I had the ambition to serve you, and for the rest of my life I shall regret that I did not succeed."

From this time the relations between Gustavus and Staël became positively inimical. On the 30th of June the Ambassador complained that he was left without instructions, to the great detriment of the

public service, and irritated his King still more by praising the consideration of the Assembly for Louis XVI. In July he received warning to keep aloof from certain persons whose influence he seemed unable to resist; he replied that, in that case, he must give up the attempt of getting reliable information, insisted that the constitution could not last, that a combination of circumstances might make the King more powerful than ever, and recommended Gustavus to prepare for the impending change, and seek the alliance of France instead of Russia. The King rejected this advice with contempt, and his secret diplomacy, represented by Fersen, kept repeating to Marie Antoinette, "*La Suède se sacrifiera pour vous.*" Thus the year 1791 drew to its close. One of the last dispatches written by Staël to his King contains a paragraph in which, alluding to the reorganization of the French army, he passes a glowing eulogy on Narbonne, the new Minister of War, the character of whose relations with Madame de Staël was well known in Paris society. At the end of January he was suddenly recalled. He left Paris on the 5th of February, and arrived at Stockholm just in time to witness the murder of his ill-fated sovereign, whose tragic end, within the walls of a theatre, was not entirely out of keeping with his adventurous, chivalric conception of kingship.

This catastrophe altered the position of Staël. His views were now in the ascendant. Charles, Duke of Södermanland, who became Regent during the minority of Gustavus Adolphus IV., adopted his policy and refused to send troops against revolutionary France. Staël was ordered back to Paris in the autumn of 1792, with instructions to negotiate for subsidies, in order that Sweden might be able to defend her neutrality and hold her own against Russia. This was a secret mission. Routerholm, the confidential adviser of the Duke Regent, alone knew of it. At this date the published correspondence comes to an end, and we are dependent on other sources for information about Staël. On his way to Paris he stopped at Brussels, and it was there he heard of the execution of the King of France, and resolved in consequence to postpone his journey. Shortly afterwards he received a letter from the Duke Regent, that the murder of Louis XVI. and the horrors that were taking place in Paris had so revolted mankind, that it was impossible to touch the French alliance without exposing Sweden to the just indignation of Europe. The Regent concluded with expressing a hope that negotiations might be reopened in happier times. Staël ignored all this, and had reason to expect the approval of his Government if he succeeded in his mission, even in contradiction to his formal instructions. He went on to Paris after having had an interview with Dumouriez, who encouraged him to proceed. When he arrived, he was received with extraordinary distinction; Le Brun, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, met him with

the most favourable propositions, but the news of the rising in Vendée and the defeat of Dumouriez at Neerwinden on the 18th of March, caused the negotiations to be broken off. Staël now received repeated warnings from the Foreign Office at Stockholm to keep quiet. When the Swedish Government was questioned by the Powers as to the capacity in which Staël was in Paris, it gave the invariable reply that he had only been accredited to Louis XVI., and that private business detained him in France. In reality, he was actively negotiating, and on the 16th of May the preliminaries of a treaty between France and Sweden were drawn up with the approval of the Committee of Public Safety and forwarded to Stockholm by special messenger. Two years previously Gustavus III. had warned his Ambassador to avoid dangerous influences, and Staël had replied that his sole object was to become acquainted with the plans of various parties, while keeping aloof from them all. This is just what he had not done; his sympathies had drawn him more and more to the side of the ultra-revolutionists, and in the spring of 1793 his political ally and confidant was no other than Danton, although Staël cannot have ignored that, ever since the 10th of August, Danton, finding the French too ignorant and too corrupt for a legal administration, had come to the conclusion that a popular system of Government in France was absurd, and that, to use the words in which Morris explains his meaning, "They had reached the period in which Cato was a madman and Cæsar a necessary evil." The master who, Danton felt, was inevitable, he aspired himself to be, and it was part of his scheme to renew diplomatic relations with the Powers. He therefore warmly advocated the Swedish alliance, and urged that subsidies should be given to Sweden in return for the recognition of the French Republic, and for the support of the Swedish fleet. Barère declares that Danton improved the occasion to induce the Committee of Public Safety to give him 600,000 francs which, he pretended, were necessary to facilitate and accelerate negotiations, and to pay the travelling expenses of Baron Staël back to Stockholm. Although the statement is made by Barère, it is not improbable as far as Danton is concerned, whose cupidity was as great as his unscrupulousness.

When the text of the treaty reached Stockholm the Duke Regent feared to accept it as it stood, and provoke thereby the anger of the Powers; he took therefore a middle course, and instructed Staël to ask for the liberation of the Queen and royal family. When this was refused, positive orders were sent from Stockholm to break off negotiations.¹ Staël then went to Coppet; but he left his secretary, Signeul, in Paris as a secret agent. Signeul was a rabid Jacobin. He remained throughout the Reign of Terror on the most intimate

(1) LÉOUZON LE DUC, *Appendix to the Correspondence of Staël*, p. 259.

terms with Robespierre, and did all he could to induce Sweden to acknowledge the Republic. Sweden on her side insisted on being subsidised for remaining simply neutral, and the controversy on this point was endless. Staël returned to Sweden in 1794. In March he signed a convention with Denmark at Copenhagen; he then spent his time between Stockholm and Coppet till March, 1795, when he reappeared in Paris on a diplomatic mission. The consequences of the 9th Thermidor made it possible to reopen negotiations, and the Committee of Public Safety, led by Cambacérès and Tallien, showed the most friendly dispositions. Staël's instructions were to insist on compensation to Sweden for the money which she had been induced to expend upon her navy. Difficulties arose on this point, and Staël had to refer them to his government. During the delay which took place in consequence, Sieyès tried to undermine the Swedish influence in order to bring about an alliance with Russia. Then, as on a former occasion, Staël resolved to act on his own responsibility and to recognise the Republic on the part of Sweden. This solemn recognition took place on the 23rd of April, at a special sitting of the Convention, presided over by Sieyès. Two days later Staël appeared again at the bar in full uniform, followed by a numerous retinue, and presented his credentials. He delivered a solemn oration, in which he expressed the hope that glorious France would rise above private interest and passion, and offer to the human race the sublime spectacle of the union between virtue and power now and for evermore. The President, who on that day was Boissy d'Anglas, replied in phrases equally pompous, and reminded the Ambassador of what he knew only too well, that even during the lifetime of Gustavus III., secret hopes were cherished in Sweden for the success of the Revolutionary movement in France.

The result of this was that a new treaty, on the basis of the one of 1793, was drawn up between the two countries. France engaged to deliver at once forty tons of gold, and as much more when the treaty should be finally ratified. Sweden bound herself in secret articles to get ten ships of war ready for sea, to demand from England the Swedish ships captured by the British fleet, and the assurance that her neutrality would be respected in future, and in case of refusal to seize all English vessels in the Sound. It is unnecessary to insist on the gravity of these proposals. The Duke Regent had previously disavowed Staël officially, but he had not ceased to agree with him in private. Now, however, Staël felt no longer sure of secret approval for his venturesome policy. What he apprehended took place; the Regent rejected the treaty, expressed strongly his alienation from Staël, and even Routerholm disavowed him in an ostentatious manner.

Two other Swedish diplomats, Engeström, afterwards Minister of

Foreign Affairs, and Brinkmann, Staël's successor in Paris, who is well known to the readers of Gentz and Rahel Varnhagen, give indeed another reason for the conduct of the Duke Regent and of Reuterholm. They assert that they had documentary evidence to prove that the Regent and Reuterholm had claimed large sums of money from France in payment for their good wishes, that Staël had made himself personally responsible for this money, and promised that he would obtain it for them. When, however, only one instalment was paid, and then nothing more, the Duke and his Councillor turned against their Ambassador.

Staël succeeded in obtaining from France a modification of the treaty, and all conditions were eliminated which might involve his country in war with England and Russia. His Government accepted it in this new form, but soon after the Convention was replaced by the Directory, and Sweden turned towards Russia. A marriage was now contemplated between the young Gustavus IV. and Alexandra, the grand-daughter of Catherine II. It was well known in Paris that these matrimonial negotiations were carried on by a French *émigrée*, Madame de St. Priest, and that the primary condition of the Empress was the rupture with France. Everything seemed arranged, when the marriage was broken off, on the morning of the wedding-day, by the folly of the Russian diplomacy. This was in the autumn of 1796. In the summer the Directory had recalled its representative, Le Hoc, from Stockholm, and, at the same time, Staël received his letters of recall. This was looked upon in Paris as almost a declaration of war, and now the insubordinate diplomat surpassed himself. He not only remained at his post, but he actually induced the Directory to refuse to receive Baron Rehausen, who had been appointed Chargé d'Affaires in his place. This was more than they could stand at Stockholm. Peremptory orders were sent to Staël to quit Paris within thirty-six hours, and an unambiguous declaration to the French Government that, if Rehausen were not received at once, the recognition of the Republic by Sweden would be cancelled and his passports sent to M. Perrochel, the French Chargé d'Affaires. This brought them to their senses at Paris. The Directory tried to conciliate the Regent by appointing General Pichegru as French Ambassador at his Court, Staël retired to Coppet, and spent the next two years in private life, partly there and partly in Paris.

He was once more summoned to the public service. In 1798, after two years of estrangement, the Court of Sweden endeavoured to resume relations with France, and at the beginning of 1799 Staël was sent to Paris to reconstruct the alliance of which he was the representative. He did not succeed. In May he asked for leave of absence, and was replaced by Brinkmann. Gustavus IV. now

became a more consistent enemy of France than even his father had been, and the public life of Staël came to a close.

He did not long survive his retirement, but died at Coppet in the summer of 1802, just as revolutionary despotism began to take the definite shape of the rule of Bonaparte. "Robespierre à cheval," this, then, was the awakening from the nightmare of the Terror, the final expression of the movement with which Stael had so keenly sympathized, and which he so obstinately defended. His wife nursed him in his last illness, but the *Dix Années d'Exil* preserve absolute silence about him. The year of his death was signalized by the appearance of *Delphine*, the defiance by a woman of public opinion, which she had offended, and which had taken its revenge. This book, according to Madame de Staël herself, marks the moment in her life when the impetuosity of youth and the craving for happiness sought satisfaction in eloquent words and impassioned creations. That happiness, however, which could not be obtained, she had learned to renounce, when summing up the results of her life, she said, "J'ai toujours été la même, vive et triste: j'ai aimé Dieu, mon père, et la liberté."

Life and history have this in common, that the storms of passion must be spent before it is possible to come back to an unprejudiced appreciation of human affairs. Those who wrote on the Revolution during the Restoration and the Monarchy of July rarely struck the balance between invective and panegyric. It has been reserved for our time to aim at a more impartial judgment. With what success may be estimated from the fact that the results of recent investigations are confirmed by the posthumous depositions of the witnesses of the Revolution, and thus, after the lapse of nearly a century, the links of the historical chain are joined.

C. BLANNERHASSETT.

A CHAPTER IN THE ETHICS OF PAIN.

THE International Medical Congress of last summer fanned the fires of a controversy which, to do it justice, has never of late years been anywhere near the smouldering point. The Vivisection Act of 1876, which it was hoped would be a final settlement, has been a mere incident in the fray. The one side has continued to pour in its steady small shot of preachings and pamphlets, which the other has met from time to time by a round of heavy artillery, when some scientific anniversary or the unveiling of a discoverer's statue gave suitable vantage ground; while occasional skirmishes in the general press have shown that each has a considerable hold on public opinion, and feels the duty of extending it to the utmost. It can be but seldom that a practical moral question, comprising so considerable a class of actions, is thus in debate in a community. Similarity of conduct survives the widest speculative differences; and two educated persons of the same society, whatever their ethical or religious stand-points, might seek far for circumstances of ordinary or professional life where they would seriously differ as to right and wrong. That duty to animals should form an exception in England at the present day is due to a combination of two causes. First, the very existence of any such duty is a quite modern discovery: marks of affection to animals in the past, in cases where the relation was agreeable to human beings, avail little against the evidence of average public opinion which history and literature supply. And then side by side with this latest product of civilisation, while it is still uncertain of its ground and rather an instinct than a principle, circumstances have chanced to arise of a nature to try it to the utmost; I mean of course the enormous and increasing development of scientific and medical activity which has claimed live animals as its material. A new and doubtfully formulated principle, and a new and complicated extension of the need for its application, have made their appearance together. No wonder then that the issues of the problem, while more or less acknowledged as moral ones, should refuse to fit with immediate certainty into any acknowledged moral scheme, and that the powerful instincts concerned should be found hard to reconcile; no wonder either that the resulting strife should present a peculiar bitterness and misdirection of attack, and a peculiar mixture on both sides of good and bad arguments. My aim is to do something towards disentangling the issues from this unnecessary confusion. Not that I for a moment hope to make all plain: the very clearing away of untenable and inconsistent arguments will bring out inherent

difficulties in the main question which have been much overlooked. But even this will be an advantage, since it is through regarding the question itself as an easy instead of a hard one that each side has regarded the position of the other as simply and culpably perverse.

Before approaching the main issue, we may conveniently get rid of a few surrounding arguments and assumptions whose chief result is to conceal it, and to make either case, at any rate in the rhetoric of the other, look as weak as its weakest point. Of these outposts two are of special importance: the relation of torture to killing, and the well-worn theme of sport. On the former subject, Professor Virchow made some typical remarks in his address at the late Congress. Starting with the fact that killing is the offence most severely punished by law, he thence infers that killing is the extremest injury one man can inflict on another; from this very questionable inference he deduces with much emphasis the general law that "killing is more than torturing;" and so arrives at the desired conclusion that it is absurd to think more of the torture of animals than of the painless killing of them, and that every opponent of vivisection is bound to be a vegetarian. Because society reserves its highest penalty for the crime which most tends to its dissolution, *therefore* the annulling of sensation, which in the case of an animal is what is meant by painless death, is *more*, i.e. is a thing to be more dreaded by or for the animal, than the maximum of intolerable sensation, which is what is meant by torture, and shooting a sea-gull is worse than plucking it alive. I may spare my readers the platitudes which an explicit refutation would entail; merely asking what would be the natural idea of a cause which needs such support?

Next, as to cruelty inflicted in sport, and in the treatment of animals for various purposes of luxury and convenience. This topic, if put forward by vivisectionists as a plea of extenuation, would clearly be quite beside the mark; for the question whether their actions are right or wrong can have no relation to the actions of quite independent sets of people. Still more hopeless is the plea when used with the implication that cruelty in other pursuits may be right or defensible; as when Virchow tries to reduce the extreme anti-vivisection case *ad absurdum* (a thing so easy to do that it is really irritating to see an able man completely fail in doing it) by saying that at that rate those who "make use of torturing methods" in the training of dogs and other domestic animals "would easily be in danger," and calling this most desirable result "a strange conclusion." When put forward to show the absurdity of attacking one evil while others much more glaring are condoned, the argument has doubtless more weight; but even here the other side may fairly reply that, while recognising abuses all round, they must concentrate their attack

somewhere; and that there is a reasonableness in beginning with a compact class, of large recent development, who are articulate, who work in private, and who take a special departure on philosophical and praiseworthy motives, rather than with a diffused body who make no professions, and merely go on doing in the full light of public opinion what their fathers have done before them for centuries. When, however, we leave the motive of the argument, and merely look at the facts alleged, the physiologists certainly seem in this country to have very much the best of it: one wishes it could be otherwise, and that, of the two, the suffering were the more prominent on the side of the events which are infinitely the less frequent. Taking the most severe of recent experiments, those made on the biliary secretion by means of fistulæ, I certainly should not hesitate to choose that amount of suffering for my last hours, rather than the night-long torment of many a trapped rabbit or broken-legged bird. As regards the greater length to which the suffering extends when a process has to be induced and watched, it must of course not be ignored in the reckoning. But, as far as the actual wound is concerned, all evidence goes to show that, after cessation of the wounding process, an animal's pain is extremely slight; and for what remains, the wretchedness of severe illness, not only must every one recognise its difference from torture, but it is just that form of distress which may reasonably be supposed to be much mitigated in the case of animals. Superior intelligence has been represented as an aid in surmounting physical distress, and when directed to religious or other objects extraneous to the physical condition it may, no doubt, so act; but when directed to the distress itself, as it normally must be in case of severe distress, I should say just the reverse. The sense of rebellion, the helpless beating about of the intellect, the counting of time and vivid sense that the next moment will be like the last, the demand ever urgent and ever baffled to find a meaning for such experience, more than all the sense of wrong that comes from comparison, the consciousness of self as an *exception*, of clueless isolation, of being marked off from normal sentient life by an intolerable something which none can share—all this points to the close relation of suffering to intelligence; and the consequent difference between man and brute would presumably be at its maximum in cases of protracted suffering below the agony-point where intellect is too blinded to be active.

But if comparisons of pains are hard to test, not so another favourite argument in which the respective mental attitudes of the sportsman and physiologist towards the sufferings they cause are compared, much to the disadvantage of the latter. Thus Mr. H. N. Oxenham, in a widely circulated pamphlet, explains that in hunting

"no part of the enjoyment is derived from the sufferings of the victim," whereas "the whole interest and excitement of a physiological experiment on a living animal, both to operators and spectators, is necessarily dependent on closely watching its contortions on the rack." Now, in giving this an absolute contradiction, I would not be misunderstood. Sins have been committed in the name of science incomparably more atrocious than any committed in the name of sport, whether we regard the degree of torture inflicted, the absence of excuse in the way of ignorance, custom, or result, or the cold-blooded callousness which has been able to remain for long hours face to face with its victim. But, as regards the actual feeling of the operator towards the suffering, there is no evidence that even the most hardened experts have gone beyond the point which is practically universal with sportsmen, the point of complete indifference. Even Magendie, in his most inexcusable demonstrations, did not operate to amuse himself with contortions, but to teach his subject and gratify his vanity. The interest of "contortions" is, indeed, a singularly unfortunate expression, contortions being precisely that which operators have been most anxious to avoid, and of which their avoidance by means of curari has been most loudly condemned. But, apart from this, the distinction between desire to arrive at a fact and enjoyment of a painful spectacle which may accompany the arrival, is surely palpable; and can Mr. Oxenham really pretend to disbelieve in the very existence of the former, that he asserts the *whole* interest to lie in the latter? Such random hitting naturally weakens the force of his blows on what is, happily, a dead horse in this country, the use of painful operations in the way of demonstration to classes. The late Professor Rolleston spoke perhaps too sweepingly, though not too candidly, of a "sleeping devil" in every heart, to which such spectacles appeal. Still a certain sort of fascination is, I believe, compatible even with the strongest repugnance, and, in their loud condemnation of the practice before the Royal Commission, English physiologists set foreign schools exactly the example one would have expected of them. But to speak of this absorbed fascination, as Mr. Oxenham does, as the "true motive" for operations of research, operations for the most part of a most busy, worrying, and arduous kind, is to treat the genus physiologist not like what some of its members have doubtless been, men impatient for distinction and callous as to the means, but like idle and desperately naughty little boys, with neither brains, objects, nor ambition.

The last¹ of these outlying misapprehensions that need be noticed

(1) Two arguments of the prophetic sort perhaps deserve a word in this list. Virchow's warning, that at this rate his opponents will soon be preventing the dissection of dead human bodies, has its pendant in their apprehension that he and his friends will soon be getting hold of living ones. As regards the former charge, the connection of a campaign whose sole watchword has been prevention of suffering with an attack on that

is one for which each side is to some extent responsible. For its expression we may again turn to Virchow's fruitful address:—"What is opposed to us is the indignant feeling of the proprietors of horses, dogs, and cats, who are excited at the idea that something similar may happen to their own beloved animals as to those of the institutes of learning;" and having soothed this sense of alarmed proprietorship by promising not to steal the pets in question, he counts in return on unrestricted disposition over the animals which are legally in his possession. Such remarks suggest that the repeated appeals of his opponents to the horror of imagining some domestic companion exposed to torture have their weak side, in giving the impression of a sort of refined selfishness. It should be possible to feel greater personal sympathy in one case than in another, without losing sight of the impersonal truth that in the world of consciousness equal pains are of identical importance. A distinction, drawn or implied, between the importance of suffering to a rabbit and to a dog, on the ground of the dog's nearer relation to the inflicter of it, can be easily wrested into supporting the dangerous distinction between the whole brute creation and man. But even were selfish affection rather than pure humanity uppermost in his opponents' minds, Virchow's sweeping claim to do what he will with his own would remain equally untenable. Torture of slaves not long ago in America, or of wives and children in the civilised communities of the ancient world, might have been similarly justified; and in gradual recognition of the claims of the weak against the strong, law naturally, though often tardily, follows in the footsteps of ethics.

The ground being so far cleared, we come to the question of principles. How are we to define the suffering that it is permissible to inflict? Most of the formulæ on the subject will fall under one of two heads: (1) the general rule of the physiologists, which also obtained the adhesion of the Bishop of Peterborough, that any suf-

from which suffering is essentially excluded, is surely mere petulance. To suppose that the common sense of a whole community would tolerate the suppression of the elementary lesson-book of every general practitioner for an object for which no sane member of the community (or at any rate no anti-vivisectionist, sane or insane) has expressed the slightest desire, is to suppose that the world will agree to go mad on a very simple question on the ground that it is divided on a very difficult one. As for the other prophecy of human vivisections, and the pictures that have been drawn of a nation debased by science in the course of two generations to the level of the tyrants or tyrannical corporations of history, we admit at once crude expressions on the scientific side which, if pressed, would admit of no logical barrier between man and brute. But the question here is of what would be permitted, not by individual logic, but by social sentiment. And in this, alike in its better and its worse aspect, we find a sufficient barrier; whether in the ingrained instinct that men are, what animals are not, members of an organism in which the treatment of each is the concern of all; or in the race-or caste-selfishness, which has always been prone in every society to make a marked distinction between members and non-members—a distinction easily abused, indeed, to the detriment of brutes, but hardly now to be transcended to the detriment of men.

fering may be inflicted on animals which is inflicted for a sufficient purpose, or which is necessary for a good result; (2) the principle, ably supported by the *Spectator*, that a man may not inflict on an animal what he would not, *mutatis mutandis*, endure himself [nor permit another to inflict on one of his own race] for the purpose in question. The fatal objection to the first of these rules is that it is not a rule at all; with an air of definition, it defines nothing, the original question merely taking another form—what is a sufficient purpose? what *measures* the good result?—which a hundred people, cynical and humane, sensible and foolish, will answer in a hundred different ways. The second rule is also a subjective one, and would justify any one who felt conscious of exceptional powers of self-devotion in inflicting exceptional sufferings; many an inquisitor, as Bishop Magee suggested, would have gone to the stake for his faith. This rule indeed, unlike the other, can claim for its subjectivity true practical value, in that it keeps in view the exact point which those who want a rule are liable to forget—namely, that the sole means to that conscientious estimation of others' suffering, which is a prime element in the reckoning, lie in imagining it as one's own.¹

(1) It is easy to make the *Spectator's* rule look absurd by neglecting the italicised words. It means no such nonsense as that the experimenter should be ready there and then, on any one's demanding it, to take the place of the animal. The large majority of experiments terminate in death, which does exactly what pain does *not* do, and puts man and brute into different categories, since loss of the human worker is not mere loss to an individual, nor even to his immediate circle, but robbery and violence to society at large. If it be further perversely argued that animals would object, if they could, even to being painlessly killed for food, we answer that the rule has no sort of claim to application in a case where we, with our complete intelligence, feel we are doing them no positive injury, but merely shutting off from them, for the support of a richer existence in another species, a tract of life which they have never even in imagination possessed. We might add that the particular animals we kill for food would, in most cases, *not* have existed at all but for that purpose; and to deplore the subsequent non-enjoyment of the actual animal whose death ministers to human life would be precisely on a par with deplored the non-enjoyment of the non-existent animals which might have existed, instead of those now used for food, had man never dominated and moulded the brute creation.

The *Spectator's* rule might further claim to have, at any rate, a logical advantage over the other in the ease with which it can be made *objective*, viz. by substituting for what the individual reckoner would endure, what the general moral sense of the community would expect, or what the *average* moral man would endure. So modified, however, it betrays its inadequacy in several ways. First, it would illogically confine permissible sacrifice of animals to near and obvious ends. In cases of human choice there is an immense difference between near and remote objects. If a person long ago has sacrificed himself for distant or imperfectly realised results, we admire him as a hero, feeling that he did a difficult thing through an act of imagination which dispensed with the ordinary aids of contemporary sympathy; and in the very act of doing this we imply that we should *not* expect the average man to do as he did. But then comes the point: in the case of an animal there is *no such distinction* between an immediate and a remote result of its suffering. The animal is as unable to appreciate one as the other; and it seems unreasonable to refrain from inflicting a certain amount of suffering for the more distant good, while willing to inflict it for the nearer, in deference to the imaginative limits of the average man, when the recipient of the suffering has no

Still, however important as a guide to individual reckoning, it has, like the first, no objective adequacy. And truly as regards chances of mutual comprehension, this inadequacy can scarcely be regretted; for taking the two rules as they stand, one would be universally repudiated on one side of the controversy, and the other on the other. What the mediator must seek is to detect under the war of words any single principle which could be accepted by any considerable number on both sides; to inquire whether each banner does not claim adherents who at bottom are much nearer to some of their foes than to some of their friends; for then an immense advance towards mutual comprehension would be made by marking the positions held on either side which are really incompatible with this common principle, and agreeing to neglect them, both as hopelessly irreconcilable, and as outside the central ground to which public opinion may presumably gravitate. That the main issue can be made to this extent definite, seems to me certain; though the principle is often confusedly expressed, or even hidden under what look like denials of it. It is no more than a carrying out of the central utilitarian doctrine. A large amount of suffering in the future course of life on this planet being unavoidable, the amount is to be made as small as possible; therefore of any two alternative amounts, the lesser is to be chosen. More fully, in measuring degrees of suffering and its undesirability, *nothing but that counts*; so A and B being either classes or individuals, if A's exemption is to be preferred to B's, it is because A's suffering would be greater or have wider undesirable effects than B's, not because A is superior in strength or intelligence to B. Deferring difficulties and uncertainties of application, we proceed to inquire what opinions on each side the general admission of this principle will exclude.

To begin then with the vivisectionists, it excludes all those

imagination to be limited, and is personally indifferent to either good. And if we may thus inflict on an animal for a less near and obvious (not less real) good what many an ordinary man would endure for a visible good to people he knows and cares about, we may certainly inflict more than the plain sense of the *Spectator's* rule would include. Then, again, the computations of a human being as to sacrifice for the benefit of unknown members of his race could not but be confused by the sense of the far-reaching effects inseparable from injury to a member of a closely-knit society. This applies more especially to the question of permitting injury to another; and here the rule seems seriously weakened by the clause in it which I have placed in brackets. The protection by society of any one of its members from tyrannous interference is obviously in its own interests, and extends to innumerable acts which no one would dream of resenting for creatures outside the human community. The clause would really make the familiar "scratching of a newt's tail" impermissible, since even lesser human injuries than this are punishable by law as assault. Nor again is "the average man" himself at all a certain factor, being often forced by circumstances into the dilemma of *seeming* exceptional one way or the other, either as a poltroon or a hero, though to say he is exceptional would be to contradict the hypothesis that he is average. ■

who regard the mere acquisition of knowledge, irrespective of any prospect or possibility of practical application, as an end in itself justifying the infliction of suffering. Such, for instance, is the position of Professor Hermann, who expressly repudiates any aim at utilisation, and boasts that "science can afford to despise this justification with which vivisection has been defended in England." This view, popular on the continent generally, has not (as far as I am aware) been anywhere endorsed by English physiologists, and certainly found no place in their evidence of 1875. It might be possible to produce a contrary impression by detaching single sentences from their context; but the most such cases really amounted to is, that the benefits of experiment cannot be expected to be always immediate or direct; and most of the witnesses were quite explicit in their statement of the practical justification of their science. The presentation of science *per se*—of useless knowledge, or (to speak quite accurately) of knowledge whose sole use would be to titillate the brains of an infinitesimal fraction of mankind—as not only a fetish with an inherent mysterious claim on us for worship, but a Moloch with a similar claim on us for victims, is simple credulity and superstition. In no other department of science has even the lesser of these claims been advanced. Even in respect of seemingly remote branches in mathematics, the stock instance of the conic sections is reverted to with pride, as showing the ultimate utility of what at first sight seemed unpractical; and all the more concrete sciences count it their great glory to bring nature more and more under the control of man, so that he may oppose her harmful tendencies and mould her forces to his will. "Knowledge is power;" that is its claim to respect; eliminate the power conferred, imagine man to retain his intellectual apprehension of facts and causes while remaining a hand-tied victim of his environment, and he would rather envy the brutes than hug himself for his knowledge. And there seems a special perversity in investing experimental physiology, of all sciences, with a majesty which may fold its hands and do nothing for us. There is a great deal of knowledge which, apart from palpable benefits, can claim value as opening out juster ideas of man's relation to the universe of feelings and forces around him, and so as having a chastening and disciplining influence on his outlook on life: such a claim would be widely made for the evolutionary theory, whose embryological and other branches have not been in any way based on suffering. But in its own special arena, physiology seems to have more than attained this stage: the future discovery of the minuter bodily processes will interest the scientific mind, but not further discipline or chasten the general mind. The science of animal function in health

and disease is emphatically a science which lacks the ordinary means of kindling the imagination: its beneficent power is not only its glory, but to the world at large its only glory. It is peculiarly unable to stir "cosmic emotion;" to claim, as most of the sciences could claim, to have a distinct value in the delight which its mere contemplation inspires. It can never (and least of all as built on suffering) become imaginatively stirring to the general public, after the fashion of astronomy, or geology, or the wider natural history of beasts and plants. Yielding to none in wonderfulness, its facts are still for the most part physically repulsive, and its conceptions not of a kind which any but professed students would be apt to dwell on: apart from questions of health and sensation, arterial pressure and the secretion of bile could never occupy a thousandth part of the place in the emotional life of mankind which is occupied by planets and tides, glaciers and volcanoes, the nebular and the evolution hypotheses. On the other hand, so far as it contributes to mitigation of suffering, the unique nature of its contribution more than redeems it in our interest and gratitude; for of all possible services, the cure and prevention of ills which outweigh and bar the enjoyment of all positive blessings, seems the first and most fundamental.

We often find reference to another class of vivisectionists, who hold that for his own species man may purchase immunities from suffering at the cost of a much larger amount to other species. This principle would of course be also excluded by our fundamental test; but I have not met with an explicit statement of it. Such a statement as that we may freely "sacrifice a hecatomb of animals to save the smallest pain in a man," quoted with horror in an abolitionist pamphlet, goes for nothing unless "sacrifice" is defined: a hecatomb of animals has been sacrificed to save every abolitionist lady the pain of not wearing gloves. Whether practices go on which could only be defended on the above principle, is of course another question; but the actual profession of it must, I think, be rare. For, in the first place, physiologists expressly prophesy a vast reduction of *animal* disease and suffering through increasing knowledge; and, in the second place, since discoveries once made remain, any justification for expecting beneficial results at all might be extended to multiplying them by the number of untold generations, so that the sum would reach enormous dimensions. I therefore mention this class chiefly because they make such a figure in anti-vivisectional writings. Thus Dr. G. Macdonald, in one of his novels, founds an eloquent sermon on such a text as, "Shall I quiet my heart with the throbs of another heart? soothe my nerves with the agonised tension of a system? live a few days longer by a century of shrieking deaths?"—questions to which one

can imagine but one answer. Such rhetoric errs as much by defect as by excess. The soothing of the author's nerves by the agonised tension of a system is a boon it is well he does not crave for, as no physiologist is at all likely to offer it him ; but it is equally wide of the mark to sum up his opponents' utmost hopes, as the mere "adding of a cubit to life," even though that cubit be the one he is himself so virtuous in consenting to forego. Give him the alternative between a certain amount of pain for twenty rabbits and a greater amount for twenty children, and I should hardly think he would hesitate : nor probably would he take on himself to stop antiseptic dressings for a single day in the London hospitals, on the ground of our owing them to vivisection ; for in so doing he would simply be baulking his opponents' purchase, of the saving of the greater suffering through the infliction of the lesser, by the contemptible expedient of diminishing the amount saved.

But whatever Dr. Macdonald might say on this point, there is an argument used on his side which expressly refuses to take count of amounts of suffering, or to attempt a comparison between what is inflicted and what is saved ; and which is, therefore, as incompatible with our fundamental principle as the views hitherto considered on the other side. The argument is that vivisection is, in its inherent nature, so morally degrading and abominable that that evil must alone outweigh any practical benefits derivable from it. In the words of Mr. Oxenham, "no progress in medical skill, though it were ten times as great as the most sanguine votaries of the modern School of Torture venture to predict, could compensate for the deep and damning degradation of all that is noblest and most God-like in the nature of man himself." Now no utilitarian need hesitate to echo this sentence as it stands ; the destructive effects of moral degradation on human welfare could not possibly be compensated. But if we give up all idea of judging of actions by the sum of their effects, and take our stand upon the single effect on the character of the doer, we shall be in danger of arguing in a circle. Mr. Oxenham must be too good a logician to infer the effect on the doer from the character of the action, while at the same time taking his view of the character of the action from its effect on the doer. Thus, if it be asked how a vivisector is shown to be deeply and damnably degraded, while *I* can answer the question perfectly in the case of certain vivisectors, I do not see how Mr. Oxenham, in his scorn of any utilitarian standard, is to answer it at all. I consider Magendie and Mantegazza deeply and damnably degraded for having sinned in the most flagrant way against my fundamental principle, and inflicted terrible suffering in numbers of cases with no benefit, and no prospect of benefit, to set against it ; and in estimating the wrongness of their actions, I can take count of further degradation,

as one among other disastrous results. But it is impossible to take one's stand simply on degradation, as constituting the supreme evil of the case, because if there were no *other* moral evil, there would not be *that* moral evil: if a man is doing what is not wrong he is not degraded thereby; and his degradation cannot be made a feature in the wrongness of his action, unless the action can be proved wrong on some *independent* ground, external to its effect on him. (There is indeed the alternative of establishing the degradation itself on some independent ground, by showing that physiologists are notorious for *other* degraded actions; but even Mr. Oxenham would hardly undertake such a Malayan muck as this.) There seems, then, no escape from judging the actions by the test of reference to the end, of comparison of the extent of the infliction with the extent of the immunity. To call this, as another able writer has done, "the Jesuit doctrine that the End justifies the Means," is to forget that in that reproach we imply just what is here lacking, our power, namely, to prove wrongness and harmfulness in the means *without* reference to the end. Those who reject our test do not really seem to see that they have but one refuge. If experimenters on animals, by the discovery of a specific remedy for cholera, consumption, or cancer, "would not have advanced far towards establishing the moral lawfulness of their practice"—if, when the question is simplified to a choice which of two sufferings is to take place, the greater is to be preferred—it can be on one ground only, that of supernatural ordinance: God sends us cancer, and that is enough. Only then the opposition of this view to ordinary moral rule, and the indispensableness to it of the theological basis, ought to be frankly avowed.

Cleared from these encumbrances, our main principle may, perhaps, obtain more explicit assent from those at any rate who are willing to be saved from their friends. But now comes the *crux*; evading which, vivisectionists misuse the principle in a way that excuses others for rejecting it. In our references to greater and lesser sufferings, nothing so far has been said implying a difficulty in estimating and comparing them. Yet the difficulty is in some cases so great that we only avoid it by admitting it to be insuperable. One suffering may be so wholly incommensurable with another that no true impression is given by calling it a hundred or a thousand times greater; in other words, the lesser, endured in a thousand frames, could not for an instant be set against the greater endured in a single frame. Nor is the essential distinction between endurable and unendurable pain at all impugned, as some seem to think, by the impossibility of drawing a distinct line between them—an argument which would equally forbid us to call yellow and red essentially distinct colours. To any person who would choose (and who would

not?¹⁾ that all the human race should suffer this night from face-ache, rather than that one, that is roughly one thousand millionth of their number, should pass it on the rack, the distinction is essential, is of kind not degree; nor would any such person consider it a *reductio ad absurdum* of his choice that he is unable to say, supposing the pain of the rack to be mitigable in a graduated scale of degrees by anæsthesia, at what precise point he would reverse his decision, though clearly such an extent of mitigation is imaginable as would demand its reversal. But extend the numbers on the other side, multiply the thousand million by another million, and the decision will be quite unaffected; and what is this but to say that extreme torture is incommensurable with moderate pain? The same false reasoning, the same demand for a clearly marked boundary-line in the definition of "torture," or "intolerable suffering," or whatever other designation be adopted, has been applied to the question of duration: *how long*, it is asked, must the suffering last, to come under the head intended? Admitting that we can include no such precise line in our definition, we again deny the demand for it to be legitimate; it is enough to be able clearly to realise cases where there can be no doubt that the line has been passed.

One point must be made clear before we proceed. The validity of the decision in the above case of the pain of many *versus* the torture of one, might be supposed to rest on this—that each in turn of the many *ought*, if confronted with the case, to consent to endure the lesser for the sake of averting the greater suffering. But this would land us in difficulties. For each one of the many would similarly be bound by utilitarian morality to prefer his own suffering to *any* clearly greater suffering of another, even though far short of torture-point, and yet would be justified in giving the opposite decision if he were deciding for a number beside himself. Thus any one might fairly choose that one person should have a very bad face-ache sooner than that a thousand should have a rather bad one. And this being so, it is clear that the peculiarity and the justice of the decision in the case first proposed must rest ultimately on that *independent* sense, which a person gets for himself without reference to morality or altruistic choice, of incommensurableness between the extreme of suffering and degrees of it falling well short of that extreme. The importance of this is clear if it is recognised as the *only* ground which will enable us, without deserting our utilitarian rule, to say that great or protracted torture may only be inflicted for the clear

(1) I had written this clause before recalling that Mr. Romanes, in a letter to the *Times*, had argued the pain of drawing London cabs to be incomparably greater than that inflicted by experiments, on the ground of their being a million cases of drawing a cab for one of torture in a laboratory. The very fact that Mr. Romanes is a clear-headed and kind-hearted man drives me to recognise our difference here as too fundamental for argument.

prevention of greater or more protracted torture. Other grounds fail us. Thus, the *Spectator* defines torture as that which renders impossible the existence of a moral relation, and substitutes a tyrannical relation, between the inflicter and the victim, making the former a mere instrument of anguish and the latter a mere recipient of it. But the alleged presence or absence of moral relation would prove very inadequate to mark off permissible from impermissible inflictions, because equally in either case it would be represented that the relation to the animal is overridden by the larger moral relation to man. Lacking some such independent ground as I have just sketched for putting torture in a separate category, I should see no more and no less moral relation between myself and a horse, whether I flogged him for the sake of bringing a doctor to an urgent case, or tortured him for some wider beneficial result. So far as there can be said to be any isolated moral relation between me and him, it means that I am not to hurt him. But in each case alike this is violated; in each case I make him a helper for wider good by doing something he personally objects to. As far as he is concerned he is a mere "recipient of anguish" in either case; or if "anguish" be too strong for the flogging, we may imagine him ridden to death, like the member of the trio which succumbed in bringing "the good news from Ghent." Could our animals surprise us as their relative once surprised Balaam, the kindest master might occasionally hear something of tyrannical relations. And it is only my view of torture as something *per se*, definable as such apart from moral relations, that enables me to condemn the infliction of the extremest anguish for which I reserve the word, while holding the ride from Ghent or the production of some days of distressing illness as legitimate.

So much, then, for principles; as to which, though unable to treat them as quite the simple affair that the current formulæ would imply, I believe I have advanced nothing on which the main body of Englishmen interested in the subject need split. When, however, we come to the practical applications, when we ask what physiology is actually doing or likely to do in the way of infliction and in the way of results, with a view of balancing them, then indeed the sides fall asunder; and I can only most briefly seek to account in some measure for the divergence, and indicate the sort of mutual allowances which might reasonably tend to its diminution.

First, then, there are legitimate grounds for strong public feeling on the subject, which should be distinguished from the illegitimate. Experts sometimes treat as a calumny the suggestion that their imagination of suffering is apt to get blunted. But that habit induces a certain indifference to other's sufferings, a certain diminution of the space they occupy in the mind, is surely too universal a truth for any one to need to be ashamed of it. In a way it is even

a mercy that it is so; if surgeons, for instance, retained through life the vividness of their earliest hospital impressions, not only they but their patients might suffer. But the point often forgotten is that this does not prevent the earlier impression from being the truer one. The useless beginner, oppressed and haunted by what he witnesses, is more truly awake than the cheerful and beneficent practitioner to events actually going on then and there in the world of consciousness. He comes nearer to a reviving of that sense of the intolerableness of severe pain which every one feels to be the true sense as regards his own pain, and which is of all things the most curiously hard to reproduce in imagination. To desire, then, that *habitués*, in estimating the pain of inarticulate creatures, should recognise their special danger of underestimating it, is only to treat them as human. Nor must it be forgotten that science has at least as little of a moralising as of a demoralising influence; that the rough and dull within her fold retain their defects, with an immense addition to their powers and temptations; and that in spite of the vast preponderance of testimony in 1875 to the humanity of students, there was (as any one on reflection would know there must be) a darker side; ignoring which, in his regrets or demands for unfettered power over animals, the most humane physiologist gives a handle to the enemy.

Again, physiological literature and addresses naturally give an impression of scientific solidarity between different times and countries which affords some ground for erroneous deductions and indiscriminate attacks; especially since we cannot prevent our present knowledge from being based to some extent on the sins of the past. No impartial inquirer can fail to know that the callousness to animal suffering on the continent, especially in France and Italy, is terrible. When we have first-hand accounts, when we find Bernard himself regretting the reckless multiplication of experiments in his own country, when we find Englishmen smiled at for their solicitude about anæsthetics, it cannot go for much that some one has observed no special abuses during a short stay in some first-class laboratory. The truth of this picture was admitted by implication in the admirable resolutions of the British Association Meeting in 1871; fragments of it have appeared with suitable comments in the *Lancet*; and many English men of science have expressed their regrets at it, both in general and in detail. But on the whole they have hardly made themselves, as they well might, the leaders and spokesmen of the English view, which their leadership would redeem from any look of priggishness. If foreigners retort with references to English sport, the expert can give the one clinching answer. He can say, "Sport is sport, but what I care about is science, and a single cruel or callous experimenter does more harm to science than fifty humane ones can compensate, and is a worse enemy to it than an army of frantic anti-vivisectionists. The tide of humanity may be at a different level in

different places, but it is irresistibly advancing; and a man who refuses to recognise this is such a blunderer at his work as to ignore one of its main conditions." Such language would have more effect than anything in inclining and helping the public to discriminate between cases which utterly differ. What ordinarily happens is this. The appropriate atmosphere having been created by mention or description of real abominations, some reassuring phrase is then quoted, *e.g.* that the painful experiments in England are comparatively few; then comes the startling announcement that ninety cats have been used in a single series, and the indignant inquiry whether that sounds few; and the public goes off with the impression that what was done to the ninety cats was on a par with the most blood-freezing proceedings of the continent. Not one in a thousand will hunt through the large blue book which would reveal to him that the cats were operated on under chloroform, and that for the four or five remaining hours of their lives their suffering was about equal to that produced in the human subject by an old-fashioned gamboge pill. The inclusion of this series of experiments in the same list with some of the worst infamies of Mantegazza is of course inexcusable: but it would be, likewise impossible, but for an idea of scientific fraternity which the science of this country might well go even out of its way to dispel.¹

Once more: who can regret belonging to the country where it is a certainty that Bernard's single classical sentence on the effects of curari, coupled with the news of such extensive use of it as he himself condemned, should spread wide excitement and alarm? But then, why should this excitement waste and discredit itself in blindly knocking its head against the overwhelming evidence as to the employment and efficacy of true anæsthetics? There is less defence for the part of the excitement which depends on ignorance of tolerably elementary facts about sensation. The language of physiologists has, no doubt, been a little loose; the lay mind may be excused for not understanding the phrase "signs of pain" to denote reflex actions in which no pain was felt. This excuse, however, goes but a little way, and nothing but a tincture of special knowledge will prevent the confounding of what tortures animals with what only tortures the

(1) It is curious in what different strata of intellectual development one finds the same difference between the English and Continental attitude towards animal suffering. That the average London cabman should treat his horse as the Neapolitan does his; that a benevolent English clergyman should imitate an Italian *confrère* in resenting interference with some children who were plucking a live bird, because it was a shame to hinder the little innocents from amusing themselves—these things are not more inconceivable than that Mr. Tennyson should give us a pendant to the poem in which M. Hugo commemorates the torture of a toad by himself and his schoolfellows; or that Mr. M. Arnold should have drawn the sublime picture in which M. Renan has described Claude Bernard, standing like an august priest at the sacrifice, and so absorbed in the hallowed function of burying his long fingers in the wounds he had made as to forget the cries of his victims.

uninstructed imaginations of men and women.¹ But again it must be said as a counterpoise, that imagination may err by defect not less than by excess; I do not mean by the callousness of habit noticed above, but by natural defect, which is the more dangerous in that, like colour-blindness, it is often unsuspected. It is strange what dim ideas the most kindly people may have of what others mean by agony. There is a paragraph in Virchow's address which looks as if it had never crossed his brain that a person can exist who would object to some experiments on animals and not to all; and an eminent witness before the Commission, as an illustration of the severest suffering he could imagine, gave a case of paralysis!

When we turn now from suffering, real and imaginary, to the past and future benefits claimed for vivisection, it is easy to damage the *strength* of the evidence by exaggerating its *clearness*, and not allowing for the confusing effect on laymen of certain inevitable aspects of it. As it happens, by far the most vaunted example, the discovery of the circulation, is precisely the one where the opposite case is strongest; or rather would be, if its adherents, instead of resting it on words of Harvey's which do not the least prove it, and so getting it demolished by Mr. Huxley, would be content to offer a reward for a loophole in Dr. Bridges's masterly argument.² And in less disputed instances it cannot but strike the outsider disagreeably that the magnitude of the result seems usually in inverse ratio to the suffering inflicted. Jenner's punctures, Simpson's chloroform-inhalations, the twitch of Galvani's frog, make a damaging foil, *e.g.* to the experimental proof by which the French mind convinces itself that animals starve to death after they have been demonstrably deprived of the means of swallowing. Then again, the scientific world may sigh over Bell's apostasy and the fogs it led him into, or smile at Fergusson's random assertion of the futility of all experiments under anæsthetics, which could only mean that an anæsthetic reverses or suspends every process of life; but names being names, the other side is not simply perverse in regarding Bell and Fergusson as doughty champions. Nor can broad generalities, as that the right basis of treatment must be intimate knowledge of vital processes in health and disease, impress their truth on the layman who knows just so much of medicine as that existing remedies have been, almost without exception, discovered empirically without any aid from such knowledge; and who finds distinct opinions in the sayings and

(1) Every one knows how exquisitely sensitive is the eye; most people know that nerves are the channels of pain; combine these two facts, and what a dreadful operation should be the cutting of the optic nerve: yet, as a matter of fact, it is painless. If certain agitators would inform themselves, among other things, of the general insensitiveness of internal parts, including especially the brain, to treatment which is acutely painful on the surface of the body, or of the fact that the animals they describe as "baked alive" succumb, as we should do, at the temperature of high fever, they would immensely strengthen their hands for dealing with real abuses.

(2) *Fortnightly Review* for July, 1876.

writings of experts, as to the inferiority in value of physiological knowledge to clinical observation. Magendie's crude scorn at the idea of vivisection's affecting medical usefulness, Bernard's "*nos mains sont vides*," Brown-Séquard's description of the teachings of vivisection on the functions of the brain as a "tissue of errors"—these cannot but seem effective weapons to those who use them.

And all this is surely a plea for long sufferance. As regards the past and present, experts might remember that their case is strongest exactly where it is hardest for others to realise its strength. That strength lies not so much in immediate applications (though between Hunter's ligatures and Pasteur's inoculations we might fill in no mean list), as in the enormously different attitude in which a doctor stands to his patient, on the intelligence of treatment which is hard to particularise only because it is so widely ramified. In the very fewness of specific remedies lies an evidence how much must be attributed to this general advance; for it is no exaggeration to say that a few months in a hospital will now enable a student to smile at not a little of a most comprehensive medical work published exactly fifty years ago by perhaps the acutest physician of his day—Richard Bright. It is not the knowledge that this will cure this, or that the other, but the clear picture of a number of processes which suggests and modifies treatment in innumerable ways. The rational abandonment of bleeding, the numberless uses of a true theory of nutrition and of the various actions of food-stuffs, the treatment of nervous diseases with reference to their origin instead of by painful local remedies—these are surely weighty instances of a substitution of rational for irrational therapeutics resting essentially on a wide and detailed picture of the living economy. That such a picture could exist but for experimental physiology is hardly pretended, though it may exist perfectly in the mind's eye of a man who has never seen a single considerable experiment; a truth strangely ignored in the argument that great modern doctors have owed nothing to the study. And indeed so all-pervading of the subject is this pictorial knowledge, that the strata of medical stupidity scarcely exist in which an anti-vivisectionist patient could be safe against somehow profiting by it.

As regards the future, the one great excuse for distrust of experts is their frequent confusion of the just claim to be the sole authoritative witnesses as to expected results, with the totally different claim to be the sole judges of the cost at which those results may be rightly bought; the latter being obviously not a technical but a moral question, to be decided on general moral principles. The larger claim lurks of course in the convenient formula that "only experts can judge of the necessity" of this or that. But for this, the public would find it easier to perceive that the act of faith demanded of them—(1) is demanded by many persons having no sort of personal ambition in the subject, and representing (if names

be weighed as well as counted) an enormous preponderance of skilled opinion; (2) is not greater than they feel to be due in many other branches of knowledge. Experts do not conceal that in many directions diagnosis, and to some extent prophylaxis, are their chief trophies; but they alone can judge of the true relation of what they know to what they hope to know; and the judgment is often a sort of trained instinct of whose processes no cut and dry account can fairly be required. The sort of stimulus to pathological science, derived, *e.g.* from mastery of the mechanism of inflammation, might be compared to the effect on philology, in its early days, of a *trouvaill*e of inscriptions in some unfamiliar dialect. To the outsider either event is barren of meaning; to the expert each is replete with promise, not of some single separate application, but of gradual amplification and modification of the grammar of his subject, and so of further command over all it embraces, through points of fusion with other knowledge which the philologist even less than the pathologist may be able to particularise beforehand. The growth of medicine is not simply cumulative, it is organic and transformative. The art has barely merged into the science, the science is still in its cradle. But it has already strangled some serpents; and to separate its past and future development from that of physiology* is an idea which (it is safe to say) would have occurred to no one, had no animal suffering been concerned.

Leaving here the region of controversy, I had hoped to add some more positive and detailed account of the application or applicability of the principles above considered: but beyond a general expression of belief that in the present state of science they would afford a sufficiently firm basis for practical decisions, I am forced to confine myself to a single further remark, which I select for its bearing on the vexed question of legislative control. The assertion that *pros* and *cons* admit, on our principles, of fair balancing by no means implies that the individual most interested is always in a position fairly to balance them. In work which necessarily concentrates interest and attention on immediate rather than more remote results, the general formula that on a balance of *pros* and *cons* science is beneficial, is easily installed in the background of the worker's mind, as a defence he can always resort to, and not brought forth to confront the actual things which are to be done under a vague sense of its sanction. That for many experiments there is not *more* than an appreciable chance of beneficial results does not imply that for many there is not *less* than an appreciable chance; and the good general character of science, *plus* the fact that the positive value of separate items of it may often be hard to prophesy or to prove, gives no right to the infliction of suffering which the general scientific mind of the time would surmise to be not in the direction of possible benefit.¹ It is this consideration which puts the sub-

(1) There are reasons why the surmise can be better hazarded in physiology than in

mission of a *bonâ-fide* investigator to control on an altogether higher footing than obtains, *e.g.*, in the case of the Factory Acts. A single expert, bent on his special idea, cannot be exactly in the position of the impartial scientific mind of his time; and the conditions of his decision in serious cases are sufficiently doubtful to make it rather a test of his realising them that he should shrink from single responsibility. But to relieve him by shifting the single responsibility to a Secretary of State is certainly not to improve matters: the chance of undue precipitancy is merely replaced by the certainty of timid and uncomprehending restraint. Whatever the difficulties of detail, the one expedient seems to be a responsible board, consisting chiefly, of course, of experts, but with some amount of representation of educated opinion outside professional ranks, even though this might entail the presence of one or two of those purblind persons who, according to Virchow's scornful distinction, "take more interest in domestic animals than in the discovery of Truth;" holding, perhaps, that the central principle we have adopted, the discovery of which at any rate required many centuries of experiments, may perhaps contain some truth of its own worth thinking about. Authoritative testimony was given in 1875 that some such board, with complete knowledge of what had and what had not been done in various departments of physiological research, would be of positive value in organizing and concentrating it; and the minor annoyance of occasionally waiting for deliberation and sanction may surely be submitted to, seeing that we have eternity before us, and that the complete moral stability of England's position in the matter is in question. That such a board would command public confidence is more than probable, while it would relieve physiologists from the burdens under which they are groaning, not only in particulars, by its more judicious use of licensing power, but by the general fact of being a reasoned and helpful, instead of a merely watchful and hostile, control. Freed thus from both the appearance and the reality of unfair restriction, English physiology, instead of appealing to foreigners to pity it, and casting regretful glances back to the pre-humanitarian days, or across the Channel to the schools whose unfettered licence the greatest of physiologists deplored, would take up with spirit its obvious rôle of proving that the best humanity is the best science.

EDMUND GURNEY.

some other sciences. Take, for instances, two prime portions of the animal economy—the blood and the brain. Before the discovery of the circulation, it might have been safely predicted that benefit would result, in ways not realisable till the discovery was made, from exact knowledge of what the blood really did. Now—I ask for information—Can the same be said of every case of exact localisation of brain centres? Could that exact local knowledge have relevance to any except local treatment? And will surgeons ever get used to removing portions of the skull for such a purpose? I am not indiscriminately attacking these brain experiments, many of which can doubtless be rendered painless; only suggesting with what caution in their case pain should be considered.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE month of November has not been devoid of considerable events in the political world both at home and abroad. If no great crime has startled mankind, and no great domestic convulsion or foreign war has distracted the attention which busy men are wont to concentrate on their own affairs, the incidents of this month's history will nevertheless deserve a prominent place in the attention of the student of the social and political evolution of modern Europe. For November has witnessed the beginning of the new agrarian experiment in Ireland by the opening of a tribunal reducing the rents of the Irish landlords; the close of the German general election, which has brought Prince Bismarck into direct collision with the majority of the representatives of the empire which he created; and the long-expected but long-deferred accession to power in France of the only man who, when the two nations were in the death grips ten years ago, proved himself a capable antagonist of the German Chancellor.

The first decision of what constitutes a fair rent under the Land Act was made on the 1st of November at Castle Blayney, in the county of Monaghan. A tenant named M'Atavey, whose wife farmed ten acres of land at Coolartua, at an annual rental of £8 16s., brought his landlord before the North-West Sub-Commissioners, claiming to have his rent reduced by one-half. The Poor Law valuation was £6. Both landlord and tenant were absentees. The former, Mr. Bond by name, resides at Hampstead, the latter is a railway porter in Manchester. The Sub-Commissioners made a careful examination of M'Atavey's holding, going over it field by field, digging up the sub-soil, and, in short, making a thoroughly practical examination of the farm. After these investigations had been concluded they declared that a fair rent would be £6 6s., or 50s. less than was being paid by the tenant. Each party was ordered to pay his own costs, but the landlord was ordered to pay half the county cess. The sensation occasioned by this reduction of 28½ per cent. was widespread, but it was not till four days later, when the North-East Sub-Commissioners pronounced judgment at Belfast in the case of the tenants on the Crawford estate, that the landlords and their friends began to be seriously alarmed. The Crawford estate was let in 1841, on leases of twenty-one years, at an aggregate rental of £430. In 1866, when the leases expired, the landlord's agent—for Archdeacon Crawford had taken up his residence at the Antipodes twenty-seven years ago—compelled the tenants, under threat of eviction, to accept yearly tenancies at an increase of 33 per cent., which brought the aggregate rental to £640 17s. 4d. It was

proved that the landlord had done nothing to justify such an increase. Whatever improvements had been made on the estate were the work of his rack-rented tenants. The Sub-Commissioners, after an exhaustive personal examination of the state of each holding, and of every field in each holding, decided that the tenants were entitled to reductions of about 23 per cent., fixing the judicial or fair rent at £472 11s. 6d., or about 10 per cent. in excess of the rental fixed in 1841. Archdeacon Crawford's income was thus summarily reduced by £168 5s. 10d. a year, and the rental of his estate fixed at 22s. per acre instead of 27s. Such a decision naturally excited the liveliest feelings of consternation and dismay among those who had confidently relied upon the repeated assurances of members of the Government that no material reductions of rent were to be expected from the operations of the Land Court. Lord Carlingford, for instance, had maintained that the Act would cause the landlords "no money loss whatever." He had, however, qualified his assertion by the *proviso* that "it would inflict upon them no loss of income except in those cases in which a certain number of them may have imposed upon their tenants excessive and inequitable rents." No doubt the Crawford estate belonged to the latter category; but the landlords took alarm, and waited to see whether similar reductions would be ordered elsewhere. They had not long to wait. On the same day that the Crawford rent-roll was reduced by 23 per cent., four tenants on the estate of Mr. Tennant were reduced 28 per cent. Five days later, the Sub-Commissioners at Limerick reduced a small tenant's rent from £19 2s. 6d. to £9 11s. 3d., or exactly one-half; and one week after the Crawford decision, sixteen tenants, on four different estates, had their rents reduced by the Downpatrick Sub-Commissioners by about 20 per cent. And so it has gone on ever since. In some of these cases the landlords' agents candidly admitted that the rents exacted were from 20 to 40 per cent. above the fair value of the land. In none had the landlords made any improvements, nor had they contributed to the cost of the improvements of their tenants on the strength of which they had raised the rent. Buildings, drains, fencing, and the reclamation of waste and rocky land were all the work of the tenant, whose unwillingness to acquiesce in the legalised confiscation of the work of their hands, enabled their landlords to extort almost any sum they cared to name. Occasionally, a tenant who had allowed his holding to deteriorate was denied any reduction, but these cases were exceptional. Only in one instance was the rent of any tenant increased. The Monaghan Sub-Commissioners, while reducing the rents on the estate of Sir Oriel Forster by from 10 to 30 per cent., made an exception in one case, and raised the rent of a tenant from £3 15s. to £3 17s. 6d. The fears of landlords at these continuous and

sweeping reductions of rent were hardly allayed by the assurance that the general feeling of the local landlords, who were well informed as to the circumstances, was one of satisfaction, inasmuch as the cases first adjudicated upon were extreme and exceptional, and could in no way be regarded as indicative of the operation of the Land Act in the majority of Irish holdings. Such assurances availed little against the alarm occasioned by the decision of the Sub-Commissioners on the 16th inst. Rents on that day were reduced from 10 to 15 per cent. at Clones, from 20 to 35 per cent. at Limorick, and at Ballina from 35 to 60 per cent. At Ballina, where rents of £19 10s. and £6 10s. were respectively reduced to £8 8s. and £3, the Sub-Commissioners were guided by the arrangement privately entered into by the landlord in relation to other tenants which had been sanctioned by the Court. Even when they were reduced they remained in excess of the Poor Law valuation. Mr. J. G. McCarthy accompanied his award by observations to the effect that a fair and moderate rental paid by contented and improving tenants were really more advantageous to the recipients than a rack rental of a much larger amount; but his suggestion fell upon deaf ears. The daily reductions reported from every district in Ireland created an impression that all rents were to be cut down, and something like a panic ensued among the landlords, while the tenants rushed to the Court literally by the thousand. When the first case was heard, not more than 10,000 applications had been made to the Court. Ten days later the Commissioners were overwhelmed by no fewer than 47,000 notices of application for the fixing of a fair rent. Saturday, the 12th inst., was the last day for giving notice affecting the pending gale of rent. The Commissioners sat up till near midnight receiving notices, and on Monday they were obliged to reject notices by "the sackful" which had come in too late. To the fear—for which there never appears to have been the slightest vestige of foundation—that the Land League would be able to keep the farmers out of the Land Court, succeeded a much more serious apprehension, that the Court would never be able to get through its business. Three additional Sub-Commissions were appointed, making seven in all, and there is talk of appointing two more. But the work to be done is so arduous, and the number of cases so enormous, that it is difficult to see how the Court will be able to dispose of the cases now before it. As yet it is but at the beginning of its labours. Leaseholders can apply till the 22nd of next February, and there are hundreds of thousands of tenants who may seek to have their rents fixed after the payment of the current gale. If all the Irish tenants insist on going into Court, the Land Court will break down far more hopelessly by excess of business than Mr. Parnell in his most sanguine moments could ever have hoped to

break it down by preventing tenants from availing themselves of its protection. The only hope is that the mass of the tenant farmers will act on the most unjustly abused doctrine of test cases, and agree with their landlords on the principles sanctioned by the Court in reference to holdings similar to their own. Already private agreements are reported on all hands at reductions varying from 25 to 50 per cent., and by this means it is probable the readjustment of rents in Ireland may be got through in the course of the next year.

As yet, despite the publication in the papers of daily batches of rent reductions, it is impossible to say what proportion of the rent of Ireland is likely to be affected by the action of the Commissioners. The widespread belief is that the majority of the farms in Ireland are let at low rents which no tribunal is likely to reduce; and it is as loudly asserted, in spite of what seem to be some very significant decisions to the contrary, that the Commissioners will not interfere with rents which have remained unchanged for a generation, or that have been voluntarily reduced by the landlords during the last few years. Rents were raised on many estates in Ireland shortly after the passing of the Land Act of 1870, before the full effect of American competition had made itself felt and the country was in the heyday of agricultural prosperity. The reductions which are now being enforced are but the readjustment of the rent to the altered circumstances of the agricultural interest. In England and in Scotland, reductions as large—in many cases larger—have been made by private arrangement between landlord and tenant. The more intelligent and reasonable landlords in Ireland have in like manner largely anticipated the action of the Court. The Land Act is only an engine for compelling the bad rack-renting landlord to do that which his more public-spirited neighbour had already done of his own accord. So far all appears like fair sailing. It is a more difficult question whether the judicial rent, which is now fixed for fifteen years, will be regularly paid. Irish tenants as a rule pay their rent more regularly than the farmers of the United Kingdom, but the prospects of farming in face of the revolution in agriculture menaced by American competition are such that very few English tenants would care at present to accept even a favourable lease for fifteen years. A widespread failure of crops, or a further development of the cheap and rapid methods of transport which enable the settler in Iowa and Missouri to undersell the farmers of Ulster in the market of Belfast, might render "unfair" to-morrow the "fair rent" of to-day. The great experiment, however, is being made, and it will be watched with the keenest anxiety by all those who are interested in the peace and prosperity of Ireland.

The first impression produced on the English public by the news of the reductions of rents was undoubtedly one of satisfaction. The decisions of the Land Court served at once as a justification of

the creation of such a tribunal and as a vindication of the reluctance of the Government to suppress the agitation which rendered its establishment possible. But at the same time that they justified the Land Act, they indirectly gave rise to grave searchings of heart among those who had at the eleventh hour given way to the general outburst of impatience with Irish agitation which found such satisfaction in the arrest of Mr. Parnell. If rents in Ireland have been so unjust that the first act of an impartial court is to reduce them all round—for such was the apparent meaning of the first decisions of the Sub-Commissioners—by 20 to 30 per cent., there was certainly some excuse for the excesses of the Land League. No doubt the Land Leaguers outraged the principles of common honesty in breaking contracts, but their offence assumed a new character in the light of the decisions of the Land Court that these contracts were in many cases unjust, and that the rents against which Michael Davitt organized the great farmers' strike were frequently little better than legalized blackmail extorted by the strong from the necessities of the weak. The conclusive demonstration afforded by the proceedings of the Court that absentee landlords, mercenary 'chargers at the best, had for ten, fifteen, or twenty years been confiscating their tenants' improvements by levying rack rents assessed on the increased value accruing therefrom, robbing the farmer under the cover of the law of the fruits of his industry, rebuked the popular indignation at the excesses of Irish agitation. If Irish tenants displayed a disregard of the difference between *meum* and *tuum*, they could at least plead that the lesson had been taught them by the landlords and the English law.

The spectacle of these successive reductions of rent excited the liveliest apprehension in the minds of many English landlords, to whose forebodings and resentment Lord Salisbury gave characteristically vehement expression at the Colston banquet at Bristol. Raising the demand for compensation, he declared that Mr. Gladstone had converted the Liberal party into "an engine for attacking private property," and that in view of the "astounding and alarming doctrines" laid down by the Sub-Commissioners, the Land Act, unless supplemented by provisions for compensation, could not be distinguished from "the spoliation of private property." Consols would be as unsafe as the rack rents of Irish landlords, unless the latter were compensated for the reductions which were enforced by the Court. The note sounded by Lord Salisbury was taken up by his followers, and next session the Conservatives will set themselves in battle array to demand compensation for the Irish landlords in addition to the other causes—such as the maintenance of the deadlock in Parliamentary procedure, and the establishment of a religious or irreligious inquisition into the creeds of the elected representatives of the constituencies—to which the Opposition is already pledged.

English politics are still overshadowed by Ireland. The Prime Minister's speech at Guildhall on the ninth was short beyond precedent, and contained little worthy of note. He spoke hopefully of the state of Ireland, where he already discerned signs of improvement, and repeated his familiar homily in favour of the reform of parliamentary procedure. Lord Granville spoke at some length on foreign affairs, and displayed that mixture of sagacity and skill which distinguish him as Foreign Secretary, and may one day be of eminent service to his country in a still higher sphere. Another important speech of the month was that which Lord Hartington delivered at Yeovil on the 4th inst. on Land Reform. The gist of his speech lay in his emphatic declaration against the doctrine of tenant right expounded by the Farmers' Alliance. While admitting that the law should give the tenant full securities for the employment of as much capital as can be profitably or intelligently laid out upon his holding, Lord Hartington said—"I do not agree with the theories which are put forward by some persons—that the employment of such capital in the cultivation of the soil give to the person so permitted to lay out his capital a co-proprietary right to the soil." He added that he declined to regard the Agricultural Holdings Act as a failure, and that he should hesitate before recommending Parliament to lay down in any compulsory enactment the manner in which landlords and tenants should act. So vigorous an assertion of his convictions elicited from the Farmers' Alliance an expression of regret and a renewed declaration that "no measure introduced into Parliament for securing tenant right will be satisfactory to the farmers of the kingdom, or to the public, unless it secures to the tenant the full value of all improvements to his farm made by him, which add to its letting value, and provided that his rent shall not be raised upon these improvements." The speeches and letters of members of the Farmers' Alliance were more explicit than their resolution, which somewhat timidly evades a direct acceptance of the issue issued by the Marquis of Hartington. Mr. Caird, one of the most eminent authorities in agriculture, addressing the Statistical Society, has strongly opposed the programme of the Farmers' Alliance; and for the moment, although the Scotch movement in favour of a revaluation of farms is spreading, the ideas of the extreme advocates of English tenant right are somewhat under a cloud.

The folly of the fears of the alarmists, who believe the foundations of society are being broken up whenever some chartered wrong is swept away, were notably illustrated this month by the universal acclaim which greeted Mr. Bright on the celebration of his seventieth birthday at Rochdale on the 16th inst. After forty years of active agitation, in the course of which the quondam "revolutionary demagogue" had achieved radical reforms in the

laws and constitution of our country, the prospect of the least of which had scared the timorous classes like a nightmare of social dissolution, not a single voice was raised to gainsay his assertion that "the great mass of the people in physical condition were enormously better than they were" when he began his labours. The crowning triumph of the celebration, however, was furnished by the *Times*. In former days that journal had frequently assured the world that the execution of the projects of reform proposed by Mr. Bright would Americanise English society, revolutionise the Constitution, and generally subject the nation to an unlovely transformation in which everything distinctly national and English would disappear. These reforms were all, or almost all, carried, and no such results followed as those which the *Times* had predicted. So on the celebration of Mr. Bright's seventieth birthday that journal actually twitted the septuagenarian statesman with the fact that English society was still English to the core, and that the English Constitution remained unmoved and intact. It was the crowning triumph of a triumphant commemoration, the unintentional testimony of the vanquished to the sagacity and foresight of the victor; and it remains on record as a memorable illustration of the fact that predictions of revolutionary change accruing from the removal of abuses may be so completely falsified by the event that even the discomfited prophets of evil feel no shame in upbraiding the successful reformer with the non-fulfilment of their lugubrious predictions.

The Stafford election, which took place on the 19th inst., resulted in the return of Mr. Salt, a popular local brewer, who had repeatedly represented the borough in previous Parliaments. Mr. Howell, a working man and a stranger, who aspired to the seat of Mr. Macdonald, was defeated by a majority of 297. The Irish voters, who are said to number 62, went over in a body to the Conservatives. Some Radicals may have followed their example, but the election was undoubtedly influenced by the gradual but general decline of Liberal enthusiasm which, more than any growth of Conservative strength, has reversed the position of parties in many constituencies. Since the general election the Liberals have lost thirteen seats and only won two, and, what is still more significant, the polls have shown a comparative increase of Conservative strength, which bodes ill for the return of a Liberal majority at next election large enough to dispense with the assistance of Mr. Parnell and the Home Rulers. Unless the Irish are conciliated the prospect of a Liberal Government in England is dark indeed.

In Germany, the general election has brought out very clearly the difficulty, not to say the impossibility, of carrying on Parliamentary Government on constitutional lines, when the legislature is made up of several chiefly antagonistic groups, instead of being

unevenly divided between two great parties. Universal suffrage being clamorously called upon by the Government to decide for or against Bismarck, decided against him with unexpected emphasis, but the hostile majority, not being homogeneous, forms no trustworthy basis on which to found a Government. The five great groups of Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, Ultramontanes, and Independent Irreconcilables are subdivided into no fewer than fourteen smaller groups, none of which command a majority of the Reichstag. The following list of parties in the German Parliament, together with their respective strength so far as it can be ascertained at present in the lately dissolved and in the newly elected Reichstag, shows both the absence of any majority and the extent to which the general election has affected the balance of parties in Germany :—

	Old Reichstag.	New Reichstag.	...
German Conservatives	59	53	
Free Conservatives (Imperialists)	49	28	
National Liberals	62	46	
Secessionists from the National Liberals	23	40	
Progressists	28	65	
Liberal Group	15	0	
Democrats	3	8	
Social Democrats	8	13	
Ultramontanes	102	103	
Poles	14	16	
Guelphs	—	3	
Danes	—	2	
Alsace-Lorrainers	9	15	
Savages	25	5	
	<hr/> 397	<hr/> 397	

The most striking feature of the new elections is the increase of the strength of the Progressists, who have more than doubled their numbers at the expense of the Conservatives. The strength of the National Liberals and their Secessionist brethren remains almost the same, although the distribution of numbers between the two sections has been altered to the advantage of the Secessionists. The Social Democrats, in spite of a rigorous proscription, have added more than 50 per cent. to their Parliamentary strength, and the nearly related Democratic party has increased the number of its representatives from three to eight. The Poles and Alsace-Lorrainers, as a rule, act with the Ultramontanes, who form the strongest fraction of the Reichstag, commanding with their Particularist allies a host of 130 members. If the two Conservative fractions coalesced with the Ultramontanes, and could rely upon the Poles and the Alsace-Lorrainers, they would form a majority of 215, but hitherto the *Kulturkampf* has proved an insurmountable obstacle to all attempts at union. The Liberals do not even afford the material for a united majority, and if the material existed it could not be utilised.

The election turned chiefly upon Protection and on the fiscal or

social projects of the Chancellor, the slightly disguised socialism of which failed to meet the support of the Socialists pure and simple, and excited the indignation of the middle classes. As a result, despite the unscrupulous exertions of the Government, the election resulted in the crushing rejection of the programme of State Socialism as propounded by Prince Bismarck. For a time it seemed doubtful whether the Chancellor would hold his ground. There was the familiar talk of resignation. All possible combinations were eagerly discussed. Nothing came of it, and when the Reichstag was opened Europe learned with astonishment from the terms of the Imperial message that the Government intended to press forward the whole of its semi-socialistic programme, exactly as if no general election had been held, and no adverse decision had been registered by the constituencies against the proposals of the Chancellor. "We hold it to be our Imperial duty," so ran the speech from the throne, "to ask Parliament to take this task to heart again"—that is, of "positively promoting the welfare of the working classes" by the Accident Insurance Bill, and "a supplementary measure having for its object the regulated organization of our industrial, invalid, and relief societies." To enable the Government to abolish oppressive direct imposts, and to relieve "the Communions from parochial and school burdens, and from other direct and burdensome dues, the safest way lies in the introduction of the tobacco monopoly, as to which we intend to provoke the decision of the legislative bodies of the Empire." These and others the Emperor admitted were "far-reaching and difficult questions, whose solution is not to be achieved in the short space of one Session;" but he declared he felt "bound before God and man to raise them without regard to their immediate success." It is well he looked forward to no immediate success. The hostility of the disorganised Reichstag renders success impossible. But Prince Bismarck entered with a lighter heart upon this war against the constitutionally expressed wishes of his subjects, because he felt assured of peace on the borders of the Empire. The re-establishment of the triple alliance was declared to be "a trustworthy pledge for the continuance of that peace, at which the policy of the three Imperial Courts in full agreement aims. Our relations with all the other Powers are most friendly." Thus, as was well said, the speech declared a policy of peace without and war within. The issues of the struggle now beginning are hidden in obscurity. But unless a coalition with the Ultramontanes can be purchased by the sacrifice of the Kulturkampf, it is difficult to see how it can have any other result than a direct collision between the Government and the representatives of the people.

Almost simultaneously with the declaration of antagonistic views between the German Chancellor and the representatives of the

Empire which he created, came the news that M. Gambetta had at last been called to supreme power in France. After a protracted debate on the Tunis Expedition, which was terminated—Kairwan having been occupied—by a vote resolving upon the integral execution of the Treaty with the Bey, the Ferry Cabinet resigned on the 9th of November. The next day M. Gambetta was sent for by M. Grévy and intrusted with the task of forming a Ministry. The work of Cabinet-making begun on the Thursday was not completed till the following Monday. At first it was stated M. Gambetta desired to constitute a "Grand Ministry"—that is to say, a Ministry which should include M. Léon Say, M. de Freycinet, M. Tissot, and other notable members of the Republican party. The notables declined, some for one reason, others for another, but all with one consent began to make excuse. Then M. Gambetta determined upon filling his Cabinet with clerks. He became President of the Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs, and distributed the remaining portfolios to men none of whom save one possess any reputation outside France. The solitary exception was the Minister of Public Worship and Education, M. Paul Bert, whose reputation as a virulent and aggressive atheist, compared with whom Mr. Bradlaugh is moderate, and Colonel Ingersoll reverential, has long been European. The anomalies of a State Church have seldom been more strikingly exhibited than in this appointment of a crusading atheist, if the phrase may be pardoned, to be Minister of Public Worship in Catholic France.

M. Gambetta's first act was to lay a Ministerial statement before the Chambers. It was a concatenation of vague phrases, which foreshadowed, more or less indistinctly, a series of reforms "which will take up the whole duration of the Chamber." Among these reforms are a slight revision of the Senate, a further purgation of the judiciary, the completion of national education, reduction of the period of military service, the purchase of railways, and some ecclesiastical legislation, the nature of which may be inferred from the appointment of M. Bert to the Ministry of Public Worship. The Senate, which is inadequately represented in the new Cabinet, displayed no cordiality on receiving the programme of its would-be reformer. In the Chamber it led to a motion of urgency for a revision of the Constitution, moved by M. Barodet and supported by M. Clémenceau, which was rejected by 368 to 120. M. Gambetta is now at last fairly in the saddle. It remains to be proved how he can ride. He has at least taken one great precaution against discomfiture. He will not be hampered by his colleagues, and as long as his majority holds together he will be almost as autocratic as the Czar. His opportunity has come. It will depend upon himself what he does with it.

November 25th, 1881.

